Quarterly

Vol. XXV. Parts I-IV

THE JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

1955—
Sept.

—1956
August

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

1957

Annual Subs., Inland Rs. 8. Foreign 14 Shillings.

Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

CONTENTS

VOL. XXV] 1955-56 [PARTS I-IV

Articles:	PAGES
Ancient relations between Indian and Foreign Astronomical systems—Dr. J. Filliozat, Paris.	1— 8
Advaita Vedānta—Mr. Isenberg, Ford Foundation.	9—18
The Vāsiṣṭha Sun and Moon in Varāhamihira's Pañcasiddhāntikā—Sri T. S. Kuppanna Sastri	19—41
Three Kannada Inscriptions of the time of the Western Chāḷukya Vikramāditya VI—Dr. N. Venkataramanaiya ...	42—68
Nāṭaka Lakṣaṇa Ratnakośa—Dr. V. Raghavan ...	69—73
Bhartṛhari's Interpretation of *'Graham Sammārṣṭi'* and *'Paśunā Yajeta'*—Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri ...	74—78
A family of Pāśupata Gṛhasthas at Jambukeśvaram —Dr. T. V. Mahalingam ...	79—85
K. S. R. I. Notes ...	86—88
The Advaita Sabhā ...	88—89
The Venkataramana Ayurvedic College and Dispensary	89—91
Obituary Notices ...	92—98
Book Reviews: ...	99—127

Acharya Vijayavallabha Suri Commemoration Volume—Asya Vāmasya Hymn—France-Asie: Presence du Cambodge—France-Asie: Presence du Royaume Laos—Notable Horoscopes—Astrology and Modern Thought—Uṇādi Kośa—Bulletin Signaletique, Paris—*Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīharṣa—The Earliest Vinaya and Beginning of Buddhist literature—Santānagopāla Prabandha—Our Heritage—Buddhism and Devotion—Gautama Buddha, the incomparable physician—Mahāvīra and his philosophy of love—India Muveszete—Kina Muveszete—The Path of the Buddha—Khalji kāleen Bhārat—Ethnological field-research in Chitral, Sikkim and Assam—Kālidāsa Lexicon, Vol. I: Basic Texts of the works, Pt. I. Abhijñāna-Śākuntalam — Bhāskarī, Vol. III—Viśveśvara Smṛti or Āryavidhāna—Anyoktistabaka of Vaṃsīdhara—Īśopālambhaḥ—Cultural Freedom in Asia—Vedānta Kaumudī—Pañcadaśī —Śaṅkaradeva and his predecessors—Existentialism, a survey, and Ancient Indian thought—Bhārata Saṅgraha—Six St. Thomases of South India.*

Supplements:	
Tolkāppiyam—Ed. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ...	73—102
Avantisundarī Kathāsāra—Ed. By G. Harihara Sastri: Introduction and Summary of Contents...	i-xv, 1-55

Statement about ownership and other particulars about newspaper.

JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

FORM IV

1. Place of Publication	..	**Madras.**
2. Periodicity of Publication	..	**Quarterly.**
3. Printer's Name	..	**N. Ramaratnam.**
Nationality	..	**Indian.**
Address	..	55/56, **Mundakanni Amman Koil St., Mylapore, Madras.**
4. Publisher's Name	..	**K. Balasubramania Iyer.**
Nationality	..	**Indian.**
Address	..	**"Ashrama", 62, Luz Church Road, Madras-4.**
5. Correspondent's Name	..	**Dr. V. Raghavan.**
Nationality	..	**Indian.**
Address	..	**Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, (Madras Sanskrit College Buildings), Madras-4.**
6. Names and addresses of individuals who own the Newspaper and partners or shareholders holding more than one per cent of the total capital.		**Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, (Madras Sanskrit College Buildings), Madras-4.**

I, **K. Balasubramania Iyer,** hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated 20—5—1957

K. Balasubramania Iyer,
Signature of Publisher.

ANCIENT RELATIONS BETWEEN INDIAN AND FOREIGN ASTRONOMICAL SYSTEMS*

BY

DR. JEAN FILLIOZAT,

Paris.

The Indian astronomical systems were among the first scientific or even cultural achievements of India studied by Europeans. At the end of the XVIIth century, owing to the opportunity given by exchanges of diplomatical missions between kings of France and Siam, some knowledge of Siamese astronomy was obtained in France. The astronomer Cassini was able, by means of information supplied by La Loubère, to outline the general principle of the Siamese system, which was, in fact, the Indian one, borrowed from India and adapted to a new longitude. A member of the French school of Far-East, M. Billiard, now working in Cambodia, is just finding evidences of the borrowing and of the change of the Indian Lanka or Ujjayani meridian to the meridian of Prome, in Burma, for the adaptation of Indian astronomical tables in Indochina. This adaptation was accordingly done in Burma first, probably by the Mon peoples. From Mon country, the Indian astronomy, so adapted, went to all other parts of the Indochinese peninsula, chiefly to Thailand or Siam, and Cambodia. New change of meridian did not happen then, it seems. And, even if some local improvements in details were done, Indochinese astronomy was almost entirely Indian. Siamese astronomy as revealed to Europe was in consequence, really Indian and, in India itself, this science was not long in being studied by Europeans. Some missionaries were interested, in the XVIIIth century, in the achievements of the Indian civilization, particularly in the field of sciences, and they were able to collect some Indian astronomical materials. On another side, scientists in Europe, and especially in France, were anxious to know the sciences and techniques of Eastern civilizations in order to appreciate their value and to take advantage of their eventual discoveries.

---

* Subject of his address on the 11th Foundation Day Celebrations of the K. S. R. Institute, 17th September, 1955.

In 1760, an astronomer of the French Academy of Sciences was sent on a scientific mission to Pondicherry, in order to observe from a place of low latitude the passage of the planet Venus before the disc of the Sun. This scientist called Le Gentil, stayed in South India for nine years and, if he was not successful in his observations owing to some circumstances, he was able to learn and publish the elements of the Tamil astronomy with the help of two competent scholars of Pondicherry, Maridas Pillai and Maliappa.

Some missionaries and scholars did enthusiastically appreciate the Indian astronomy. But others, pointing out that Indian astronomers were hardly observing the sky and almost never trying to improve their classical science, surmised that the Indian astronomy was not genuine. According to these, it came from other countries and was used by Indians, mechanically after translation or imitation of foreign models.

The lack of new researches by Indian astronomers who nevertheless were taking pride in their science that it had been perfect, was producing unfavorable prejudices against this science. Going from one extreme to the other is common. Whereas some claimed for India the discovery of all sciences and the first teaching of these to all the peoples in the world, others thought that she never possessed any science produced by herself.

Now, we should pay more exact justice to Indian science and examine afresh the problems of its foreign contacts. Placing it in the perspective of general history, we can trace its actual loans and borrowings and ascertain its real position.

First, we have to note the permanent importance of astronomy in the Indian civilisation. The Sanskrit astronomical literature is very rich, it is one of the biggest in the world. Of course, many books are merely various manuals of the same teachings, but the creative and critical period was long for the Sanskrit astronomical literature and the production of astronomical authors appears in every period of the history of India. We have therefore to examine all along that history the possible exchanges of astronomical systems of India with those of other countries.

The more characteristic and fundamental element of these Indian systems is the list of the stars chosen as landmarks on

the way of planets, *i.e.*, the list of the *nakshatras*. It appears already in the *Yajurveda, Taittirīya* (IV, 4, 10) *Maitrāyaṇī-saṁhitā* (II, 13, 20) and *Kāṭhaka* (XXXIX, 13), as also in the *Atharvaveda* (XIX, 7). It is already fixed, as it appears in classical astronomical literature in later times. Only a few differences of names are to be pointed out. The number of the *nakshatras* is not the same in all sources: 27 in *Taittirīya* and *Kāṭhaka*, 28 in the two others. Thanks to that difference, we see that already in Vedic astronomy, as later in classical astronomy, it was of current use to take or not to take into account the *nakshatra* Abhijit, the star Vega. Possibly, it must be added, the two numbers were originally chosen together as they are round numbers. One is higher and the other is lower, for the duration in solar days of the Lunar month, the exact duration of which is between 27 and 28 days. In any case, the moon's daily run is roughly measured by one fraction of the whole circumference divided by 27 or 28, *i.e.*, measured by an arc corresponding to one *nakshatra*.

The use of *nakshatras* as land-marks for the positions of the planets exists not only in India and in the countries under the direct influence of India, but also in Chinese, Coptic and Muslim systems of astronomy. In Egypt, the Coptic sources giving lists similar to those of the *nakshatras* and, in Muslim scientific tradition, the books enumerating the *manazils* or "Lunar mansions" corresponding to *nakshatras* are not ancient. Considering Egypt and Muslim culture, priority of use of the system unquestionably belongs to India. Until the matter is investigated, we don't know if that system was adopted in Egypt before or after contacts with Arabic science, but, as to the latter, we can suppose with great probability that it borrowed the Indian system, directly or through Persia, at the time of great exchanges between Indian and Iranian sciences, to which we shall refer later.

Regarding the Chinese system, the case is quite different and much more difficult. The stars chosen in China are almost exactly identical with the determinative stars of the Indian *nakshatras*. The name of these stars is *sieou* in Chinese, and the sieou system is ancient in China. Unfortunately, the date or the first Chinese documents on the *sieou* is still under discussion among Sinologists. Under these conditions, we are not yet able to ascertain if the Chinese

system is earlier or later than our Vedic texts. Nevertheless the use of *sieou* in China seems much more ancient than the first known intercourses between China and India during the period of the expansion of Buddhism abroad, that is to say chiefly during the first centuries of the Christian era. Truly speaking, Chinese peoples are referred to in the *Arthaśāstra* ascribed to Kauṭilya in the time of Candragupta, that is to say the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the third B.C., but the reference may have been added to the work of Kauṭilya, as it was quite impossible at his time. The name indicating the Chinese in the *Arthaśāstra* is *Cīna,* a Sanskrit transcript of *T'sin* and in the third century B.C. China was not yet called *T'sin.* That name goes back to the second century B.C. only. In any case, even if India had some knowledge of China at the time of Candragupta, and even earlier, we have no indication of any intercourse with China in Vedic times.

This fact prevents us from admitting both theories, the one which supposes a borrowing from India and the other which surmises the opposite way. The hypothesis of parallel independent formations of the two lists of *nakshatra* and *sieou* is, at first sight, hardly probable. The selected stars, indeed, are frequently rather small stars, the choice of which would be very difficult to explain by a natural necessity, imperative for both Indian and Chinese astronomers independently working on the same sky with the same purpose of marking the path of planets.

Under these conditions, only one hypothesis has appeared possible to several historians of sciences to be possible: India and China would have drawn from a common source. And, as Mesopotamian peoples are famous for their achievements in astronomy in high antiquity, it is frequently thought that both India and China derive their systems respectively of *nakshatra* and *sieou* from a Mesopotamian source. But, in fact, such a system never appeared till now in any Mesopotamian document and we have no more right to suppose the unattested doctrines than the unattested historical intercourses. Provisionally, we must leave the question open. In any case, we have to examine the probable use of the system at the origin. It was elucidated by Leopold de Saussure on pure astronomical grounds but in accordance with what we know about the ancient astronomical ideas of India,

At the first stage of astronomy in India an important question was the fixation of the relation between the paths of the Sun and the Moon. The position of the Full moon in the sky, which is opposite to the position of the Sun at the same time, was noticed and the observation of that position in one *nakshatra* immediately gave the position not directly observable of the Sun, as soon as the diametrical oppositions of *nakshatra* were systematically known. For example, when the Full Moon is observed in Āśleṣā the Sun is in Śraviṣṭhā. And that process of determining all monthly positions of the Sun is much more precise than the observation of heliacal risings and settings of stars used in zodiacal astronomy of Mesopotamia and West. The Chinese also wanted to reach an exact determination of the positions of the Sun, by means of the observation of the Moon in the *sieou*. And, as both in India and China, the choice of diametrically opposite stars for each *nakshatra* and *sieou* was leading to the same stars, not necessarily the brightest, it is not, after all, quite impossible to admit independent constitution of similar systems in the two countries at the origin. A general concordance thus naturally prepared between *sieou* and *nakshatra*, may have been completed in later times, after the beginning of historical intercourses between India and China.

Another concordance of astronomical teachings of India and foreign astronomical theories deserves our attention for the ancient period.

According to Censorinus, Heraklitus gave 10,800 years for the length of the Great Year, that is to say, the period during which each of the heavenly bodies simultaneously completed a round number of revolutions, in order to reach at the end of the period the same positions as at the beginning. On the other side, the Babylonian astronomer Berossos gave 432,000 years for a great Babylonian astronomical period. The first figure immediately recalls the 10,800 *muhurtas* into which the body of Prajapati as *samvatsara*, the "Year" is divided. The second recalls the 432,000 syllables contained in the *Ṛgveda*, the 432,000 years of the Kaliyuga and 4,320,000 years as measurement of the Mahāyuga. It is hardly admissible that these numbers were independently obtained in India, in Greece and in Babylonia. Some contacts between the astronomical speculations of the three countries is much more

probable and, in that case, we have no difficulty in ascertaining the period in which it was possible.

The time of Heraklitus was about 535-475 B.C., that is to say, the time of the beginning of the establishment in Indus valley of the rule of the Achaemenidean kings of Persia who were also ruling some of the Greek countries. About 519, the Greek Skylax was sent by Darious to Kaspapyrus, in Sanskrit Kasyapapura, now Multan, to prepare the conquest of Sindh. Berossos was an astronomer in Babylon in the time of Selucides Kings two centuries later, just after the expedition and the death of Alexander, when Antiochos became king of Babylon and when Candragupta added to his empire the Indian provinces formerly occupied by Persians. During the two centuries of the Persian occupation of some Greek countries of Babylonia and of the Indus valley at the same time, cultural exchanges were easy between these countries, chiefly owing to the usage of a same body of Babylonian officers in the various parts of the Persian Empire. We have, indeed, other facts pointing to such cultural exchanges. We have been able to gather some evidences of relations between Greek and Indian systems of medicine in the same period. Moreover, the very existence of the *Kharosthi* script, a kind of transliteration of Indian *Brahmi* with the Aramean alphabet used among the Babylonian officers, is a clear evidence of communications between Babylonian and Indian educated peoples. The same *Kharosthi* is adapted to the scientific phonetical rules given by the Indian grammarians, rules entirely unknown in semitic alphabets. We have also been able to trace similarities between a very popular Akkadian manual of diagnostics and prognostics and a teaching on prognostics incorporated in Ayurvedic works, though not in full accordance with general Ayurvedic doctrines. We can suppose in the last case a borrowing from India to Mesopotamia at the time of Persian Empire. Under these conditions, we can easily surmise communications between Greek, Babylonian and Indian astronomy in that time. We can see also that the figures most probably came to Heraklitus and Berossos from India. In India, indeed, they are attested much earlier and well explained by pure Indian speculations. The number 10,800 already appears in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (X, 4, 2, 18—20), that is simply the number of *muhurtas* in the year as there are, according to Vedic ideas, 360 days in a year and 30 *muhurtas* in a day.

432,000 is 10,800 multiplied by 40, the number of syllables in a *pankti*, the *pankti* being used as the unit for measuring the length of the Veda and the Veda being linked to the year.

In the most ancient Indian astronomy, astrological speculations are very few. No system is found for the forecasting of the destiny of persons on account of the rising stars at the time of their birth. But, later, in the first centuries A. D. astrology began to be widely developed and at the same time some astronomical books appeared referring to the astronomy of the Yavanas, using the zodiacal *rasi* system side by side with the *nakshatra* system and using also a number of technical Greek words just transcribed in Sanskrit. That fact is well-known and is a consequence of active intercourse between India and the Roman Empire at that time. Some Mesopotamian astrological principles may also have already been introduced in India during the Achaemenidean period, and as a general rule, we see that ancient Indian astronomy was rather strictly cosmographical and through influences from Mesopotamia and Greece, later became astrological. But astrological speculations do not contradict with the progress of the cosmographical astronomy. On the contrary, astrological forecasting requires exact knowledge of astronomical positions. Both in Roman empire and in India, astrological work was accompanied by astronomical and mathematical discoveries which were later on adopted by Iranian and Arabic sciences.

We know through Persian and Arabic sources that Indian sciences were cultivated in Persia in the centre of learning of Gundeshapuhr, before Islamic invasions. In the subsequent period, Arabic science began to constitute itself with many references to Indian sciences before mass borrowings to Greek tradition. Reports of Alberuni on Indian science and reference in Arabic sources to Indian arithmetic and trigonometry are well-known. The invention of the trigonometrical sine is ascribed by Al-Battani to Indian astronomers and in fact, we do not know of any use of sines in any country before its appearing in Indian astronomical works. The numerals called in Europe "Arabic numerals" are called in Muslim tradition "Indian numerals" and actually India was the first to use and propagate in the world that system of nine figures with the cipher.

According to epigraphical evidence, the cipher itself was first used in Mesopotamia in cuneiform documents, as it is used in every system in which numerals have a positional value in order to mark the lack of an order of numerals. In the ancient epigraphical documents of India it was not in use, as numbers are written with special figures for tens, hundreds, thousands etc., as well as for units. In inscriptions from Nānāghat and Nāsik we have many samples of these notations. But, as shown by the method of extracting square roots described by Āryabhaṭa about 500 A.D., the nine numbers with the cipher and the positional value was in use before their first known instances in epigraphy. So, we do not know exactly at what time the now universal system was invented in India. On the other side, as some of its elements were first in use in Mesopotamia, it is likely that they were known also in India during the period of intercourse of Babylonian and Indian scholars at the time of Persian Empire. Under these conditions, the great discovery of the system was probably prepared by attempts of different peoples but was done and diffused by Indian scholars.

Thus we have seen that the relations of Indian astronomy and allied sciences with foreign knowledge and technical practices have been very frequent and various since ancient times. They were also highly fruitful for the increase in general astronomical and mathematical progress both in India and in the world. The Indian field of scientific research was not secluded. Immense in itself and widely extended in Asia, it became also, owing to its exchanges with ancient Mesopotamian, Iranian, Greek, Chinese and Arabic circles, a part of the universal field of scientific progress. Our short examination of the relations between ancient Indian and foreign astronomical systems enables us to see their importance and their significance for the high estimation of the role of India in the world in the light of history. Questions of antiquity and priority are far from being as important as questions of value and efficiency. All that concerns the origins is doubtful, in the absence of complete documents.

ADVAITA VEDANTA*

BY

MR. ARTHUR ISENBERG,
Ford Foundation.

I shall not hide from you the fact that I was both pleased and embarrassed when our learned Chairman, Professor Raghavan, invited me to talk to you tonight about Vedanta and Sri Sankaracharya. *Pleased*, because without becoming a Vedantist I have come to admire the system known as Advaita Vedanta and the lonely spiritual giant who has given it a cohesion and clarity unknown to most, if not all, other philosophical systems. *Embarassed*, because my credentials as a lecturer on Vedanta are so imperfect as to be almost entirely wanting. I am not a Sanskrit scholar—merely a lover and beginning student of that ancient language ; as for philosophy : once again I am not a scholar but merely one who agrees that " the unexamined life is not worth living," one who has read, perhaps widely, but certainly unsystematically.

If, then, there be anything of value in what I am about to say to you it might well be this, that it may be interesting to you to learn how certain concepts of Advaita Vedanta appear to a sympathetic and interested layman from the Western World. And I know that I can count on your generous indulgence if my words betray my ignorance, for, as students of Sri Sankara, you are of course familiar with the great importance he attaches to *avidya*.

I have often been struck by a strange fact: our ignorance about the lives of so many of mankind's wisest members. We do not know with certitude when Li Pe-jang better known as Lao-Tsu was born or when he died. We do not know when Gautama the Buddha lived. We are not sure of the years of birth and death of Socrates; Jesus Christ; Mahavira the Tirthankara. These men have somehow managed to remove their egos from the scene and to live on in their thoughts. Perhaps we have here one of the laws of spiritual eminence:

---

* An address delivered at the Sankara Jayanti Celebrations, Sankara Gurukulam, Abhiramapuram, Madras, 18th May, 1956.

that the great spiritual teacher must—and I should emphasize 'must'—be *self*-effacing.

Be that as it may, Sankaracharya shares with those already mentioned the mystery that veils their personal lives. Tradition places his birth somewhere in the second century B. C. Modern scholarship moves the event nearer to our own times, to the seventh or eighth century, with perhaps a preference for the year 788 A.D. All agree that he died young, in his early thirties. We are told that he was born in Kaladi, in Cochin, in a family of Nambutiri Brahmins; that he wandered all over India, from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas, engaging the learned men of his time in philosophical discussion; that he founded a number of *maths*; and that he died near one of them—Badrinath—in the Himalayas. Most of the rest of what we are told of his life is legend and anecdote and need not detain us now, for, after all, mankind has always felt compelled to surround with legends and anecdotes—they are usually remarkably similar whether told in China, India or Greece—the lives of its greatest sons. We are told that they could and did revive the dead, heal the sick, tame the wild, and so on and so forth. The kernel of philosophical truth in all this, it seems to me, is that the lives of our greatest are symbols and symbols are inexhaustible for those who ponder thereon.

But what of the lofty system of thought reared by the man whose birthday we are commemorating? If I have rightly understood it, it might be summed up—inevitably over-simplified—somewhat as follows:

Only one Entity is ultimately real: the *Nirguna Brahman* of which nothing positive can be predicated, since to do so would be to limit It. Of It, we can only say *"neti, neti."* It cannot be described; but it can be experienced.

From this Ineffable Entity everything else is *derived.* The entire Cosmos, the phenomenal universe, including our egos (the *"aham"*) but not the self (the *Atman*) is derived "like the spiderweb from the spider." This is the result of *Maya.*

Maya is—What? We see the word often translated as "Illusion." Properly qualified or understood, "illusion" may serve. The danger is that many people do not distinguish between "illusion" and "hallucination" and whatever Maya

may or may not be, it is not hallucination. The universe has more reality-content in Vedanta than the snakes seen by an acute alcoholic out of nothing. Sankara himself has given us many analogies: the snake which turns out to be coils of rope; the silver which turns out to be mother-of-pearl; the thief who turns out to be a post; etc. Please note that in all these analogies *Maya* is portrayed as a creative mis-interpretation of something real rather than a total creation out of nothingness. Good logician that he is, Sankara does not violate the doctrine, "*ex nihilo nihil fit*."

But what, then, *is Maya*? I propose to translate the word by the phrase "artistic creativity." *Maya* is the power which enables a Kalidasa to seize a number of words and ideas—mere words! and arrange them into an enchanting *Sakuntala*. *Maya* enables a Rembrandt to fling pigments of dyestuff on to an empty canvas and to create a *Nightwatch*. And looking at a good painting we are so carried away that we do not—fortunately—realize that the beautiful landscape, the charming woman, the playful child are none of them *really* there, that all is color pigments cunningly grouped and arranged to make us forget the raw materials out of which the work of art itself is wrought.

Let us stay with the analogy of the painting a little longer.

Suppose that we had before us a painting of an old man, say one with a white beard. If I invited you to gaze at it, you could easily do so. If I asked you to pick up the painting of the old man, you could do that, too. If I asked you, "What do you see?" you would tell me: "An old man." And if I pressed you and asked: "Is it really a picture of an old man?," my persistence might puzzle you, but you would reply: "Yes, Of course it is."

But now I ask another question: "This painting of an old man: will you not agree that it is really just a clever arrangement of pigments?" I take it, you would agree. I might pursue our discussion and ask you: "Will you not agree that the pigments are *really* just mixtures of chemcial compounds and can be separated?" Having secured your concurrence, I should continue the inquiry by asking you whether, "in reality," the chemcial compounds were not "really" just configurations of atoms; and whether the atoms were, in reality, not merely groupings of electrons and protons,

Let me, at this stage, propose a definition. Let us agree to call that of two things more relatively real which has greater independent duration. Perhaps an example will make the meaning clearer. Suppose that a potter is asked to fashion a pot out of clay. Clearly, there can be no pot unless there *first* be clay. The clay existed before the pot and the pot can be squashed out of existence again without any loss of clay. In other words, the clay is a necessary antecedent for the pot. The clay can go on being clay without ever once being shaped into a pot. The pot owes its very existence to the clay, but not vice versa. Using the proposed definition, I would say that the clay in our example is more relatively real than the pot.

Let us apply this definition to our painting of the old man. We discover a hierarchy of relative realities, the least relatively real aspect being that of the painting as such, followed in ascending order of relative reality, by the pigments, the compounds, the atoms, the electrons and protons.

I beg leave to invite your attention to two features of this analysis: first: there is nothing mystic, let alone mysterious, in our definition and concept of relative reality. Second: we are led to the perhaps astonishing conclusion that the more relatively real something becomes the more abstract and intangible it grows. The painting of the old man you can handle. Pigments you can still see and hold in your hands. Molecules may still be rendered visible through an electron microscope. But electrons and protons can be rendered perceptible only through their effects. And this is the place to note that we are, after all, dealing only with an analogy: for the electrons and protons are not the end of the line, even in physics. They are regarded as congealed energy. This leads me to suspect that since matter is now regarded as merely another aspect of energy, congealed energy, that energy itself may be merely another aspect of yet another something; congealed mind-stuff, for instance.

But we are not yet through with our painting of the old man. If we look at the painting through a microscope, the painting will—literally—disappear. In fact, we may say without fear of contradiction, that on the level of electrons and protons the painting simply does not exist at all. On the other hand, we may see and say that to a person absorbed in the

painting as painting, there are no electrons and protons simply because on that level they are irrelevant.

This explains why so few of us, absorbed as we are in the business of living, pause to think of *Maya*, of the fact (if our definition was right) that the phenomenal universe represents merely a relative or a derived reality. It is hard to tear oneself away from the contemplation of what is pleasing or at any rate fascinating and, in a sense, to destroy it in order to uncover a deeper, let alone the ultimate, reality. It is to Sankaracharya's everlasting glory that he did just that. Let us note just one more lesson which the painting analogy can teach us, and we shall be done with it. To say that the Painting Level is *un*-real because it is relatively less real than, say, the pigment level, is to talk nonsense. Of course it is real! But it *becomes* unreal as we proceed to levels of progressively greater reality.

Similarly, the universe in which we live is real enough. But, if Advaita Vedanta is right, it becomes progressively less real as we grope toward levels of greater reality; and when we are once more back in ultimate reality—in *Nirguna Brahman* the phenomenal universe will—then and *only* then—become totally unreal. Here, too, we may say with an Italian scientist: "It is the scale of observation which *determines* the phenomena."

We have spoken at some length of *Maya*, the creative, transforming power which orders the progress from one level of reality to another. We must now speak of another key concept of *advaitavada*: *avidya*.

Avidya, as is well-known, is ignorance. But what kind of ignorance? I think that in the strictest sense, *avidya* is not just any form of ignorance but a necessary concomitant of Maya, *creative* ignorance. Sankara declares that the *Nirguna Brahman* is the only ultimately real entity and that it is both immanent and transcendent. It is inactive, yet responsible somehow for all activity.

This raises a question to which there can be no certain answer, only speculative reasoning. The question: why this Brahman activity at all? What is the motive? Let us hear how Sankaracharya answers this—perhaps the ultimate—riddle. He says:

> "We see in every-day life that certain doings of princes or other men of high position who have no unfulfilled desires left have no reference to any extraneous purpose but proceed from mere sportfulness, as, for instance, their recreations in places of amusement. We further see that the process of inhalation and exhalation is going on without reference to any extraneous purpose, merely following the law of its own nature. Analogously, the activity of the Lord also may be supposed to be mere sport, proceeding from his own nature, without reference to any purpose. For on the ground neither of reason nor of Scripture can we construe any other purpose of the Lord. Nor can his nature be questioned. Although the creation of this world appears to us a weighty and difficult undertaking, it is mere play to the Lord, whose power is unlimited."

This, as many of you will have recognised, is taken from Sankara's Bhashya on the Vedanta-Sutras, (Second Adhyaya, First Pada, Sutra 33) the one which says:

> "33. But (Brahman's creative activity) is mere sport, such as we see in ordinary life."

What has all this to do, you may ask, with *Avidya*? I think the answer could well be this: If Brahman *is* the only entity that *really is*, its sporting must of necessity proceed with itself. But what sport can there be in an activity which is exculsively self-created and self-conscious? Since neither the Vedanta-Sutras nor Sankara disdain drawing on "ordinary life" for an analogy in this difficult task of assessing the ultimate motive, let us make bold to follow their example.

Suppose you go to the theatre to watch a play. Surely you can derive no entertainment, no "sport", if you remain at all times fully conscious that you are watching mere make-belief. To enjoy the play you have no choice but somehow to manage to forget for a while that what you are watching is not *really* real; that the end of the play already exists; that the heroine is not really a suffering queen—is not a queen at all—but just an actress. If at all times you kept thinking, "Oh well, it is all make-belief!" you could not enjoy the play.

Or take your dreams. In them, you participate in strange doings, now enjoyable, now frightening, always interesting. You are not, as a rule, aware of the obvious fact that you

yourself are the dreamer, the playwright, the actor, the designer of the stage set. If you were aware of these facts, you could no longer "sport" in your dream. In other words and this is the point—there can be no "sporting" without *avidya*. To remember, to gain "Vidya", is to end the dream, to end the enjoyment of the play. Hence: *avidya.*

Let us quote Sankara once more. I think he is, as usual, unambiguously clear on this point. He says:

> "As clay is the efficient cause of the pot, so is ignorance declared by the Vedanta to be the efficient cause of the Universe. When that ignorance itself is destroyed, where then is the universe ?......When the ultimate reality is realized, the universe vanishes."—(The quotation is taken from Sankara's "Aparokshanubhuti")

I cannot resist the tempation to digress for a moment.

I happen to think that one of the finest artistic and philosophic conception ever created by the mind of man is that of the Dancing Siva, Siva Nataraja. To me, it sums up the essence of Sankara's conception of the world. We find in it a representation of the universe as an emanation of Siva, the sporting deity. Many of the symbolic features of the work of art are well-known and well explained: how the material universe (represented by the tiruvasi, Prakriti) springs into existence as vibrations emerge from Siva's drum ; how the universe will end, temporarily, through the fire, held in Siva's hand ; the gesture of "have no fear!", the pointing to the auspicious foot—all that I learned long ago. But it was until after some six years of thinking about the Nataraj concept from time to time, that yet another meaning implied in the symbol suddenly struck me:

Most of the Nataraj statues, as you know, show Siva dancing or trampling on a dwarfish figure. This figure is, of course, none other than our old friend, Ignorance, *Avidya,* although it has many other names, including "EVIL" or "Sin." But I like to think of it as *Avidya.* Siva stamping out Ignorance! I liked that thought. Until it occurred to me that if Siva is stamping out ignorance, it is equally true that Ignorance provides the only footing for Siva. Look at the statue of Nataraj ; remove the figure of Ignorance and what will Siva have to stand on? Literally nothing. And

thus we see again how right Sankaracharya is when he declares: "when the ultimate reality is realised, the universe vanishes."

It is Siva's destiny to help man overcome ignorance. His own end is implicit in the success of that mission. For, as Sankaracharya says, end ignorance and you end the universe, including Siva. What is left is only *Nirguna Brahman*, ultimate reality.

I do not find in this awesome edifice of thought much consolation, unless it be the affirmation, by a ruthlessly honest and profound thinker, that there is, there exists an ultimate reality at all. But if the thought-edifice is stark, it has the tremendous virtue—at any rate I so regard it—of being completely self-consistent. I know of no other system so free from internal contradictions. To have been the architect of so flawless a building is an achievement that must leave us lesser men breathless and awed.

There may be more consolation in the philosophic and religious systems of others, particularly of those who assure us that the purpose of the universe is the eventual triumph of good over evil. I frankly admit that I find it personally impossible to reconcile my experience of the universe with the notion of the supremacy of morals at the core of creation. I reckon it an advantage, not a flaw, in Sankaracharya's system that it leaves morals wholly and entirely within the realm of man's responsibility. You will derive no authority from Sankara for any attempt to saddle the ultimate deity with responsibility for man's good and evil deeds. Morals are of the utmost importance to us as mortal men and women. We—and we alone—must bear the responsibility in this sphere. No ultimately real god can ever be used as a scape-goat by us for the evil we bring into the world. This may be a harsh sentence. But it lends significance to our lives: we are not someone's marionets.

Progress along those lines may be painfully slow. But can we afford to disagree with the words of a German poet, Rueckert, who said:

> "Whither we cannot fly, we must go limping.
> The Scripture saith that limping is no sin."

One final remark; I believe that it is not an accident that among the world's outstanding theoretical physicists of the

western world so many—I am speaking relatively—should have been attracted to Vedanta. The reason is, I think, quite easy to see: Advaita Vedanta provides a complete philosophical and conceptual framework within which the findings of advanced modern physical science can be placed without stress or tear. Monism seemed unattractive as long as scientists had to believe in the separate natures of matter and energy. But now that matter and energy have been proved to be equivalent aspects of one underlying something, the appeal of monism has become far greater, if not indeed irresistible.

It is an interesting fact that Eastern and Western thought should in our century, for the first time, find themselves arriving at similar conclusions after journeying through the centuries in diametrically opposite directions. For time was when the East said, in effect: "Our external enviornment is purely phenomenal. No approach to ultimate reality can be made by its observation and manipulation. The road lies through introspection." While the West, at least ever since Galileo, said, in effect : "We can make progress toward an understanding of reality only through controlled, repeatable manipulation of our environment, that is, through experiments. All other roads are not to be trusted, are purely subjective and without probative value." And for a while—throughout the nineteenth century—it looked as if the Western approach would lead to a universe based on nothing more complicated than levers and gears, a gigantic but perfectly orderly mechanism. This dream came to an abrupt end with the discovery of the phenomenon of radioactivity and its following of a non-mechanical set of laws. The end of materialism in science was not long-delayed. One by one, mechanical and material models had to be given up. But to me the most surprising thing about this state of affairs was the realisation that the thought structure reared by men like Sankaracharya was fully capable of accommodating the preplexing new insights of the men of science of the West.

The scientists—or at any rate some of them—are aware of these changes. Says Sir Arthur Eddington: "We are no longer tempted to condemn the spiritual aspects of our nature as illusory...We have travelled far from the standpoint which indentifies the real with the concrete....Our system of

philosophy is itself on trial." (*Science and the Unseen World*).

India today is benefitting in many ways from Western Science—a science no doubt greatly enriched by the many contributions of Indian scientists, men like Raman, Bose, Chandrasekharan. This is as it should be. But the western world too is beginning once more to benefit from the deep voyages of exploration into the nature and role of man undertaken by Indian explorers no less intrepid and infinitely more lonely than the men who braved Mount Everest. A growing number of people in my own country, the United States, are delving into the treasure of your philosophy. A recent translation of the Gita found more than two and a half lakhs of readers in the United States within less than one year. I envy my fellow-countrymen the intellectual excitement which will be theirs when they first discover the writings of men such as the one whom we have gathered to honour today.

Or let us, more truthfully, say that in honouring the memory and work of Sri Sankaracharya we are just honouring ourselves. Thank you.

THE VĀSIṢṬHA SUN AND MOON IN VARĀHAMIHIRA'S PAÑCASIDDHĀNTIKĀ

BY

T. S. KUPPANNA SASTRI

The Vāsiṣṭha Sun and Moon are contained in ch. II and in ch. III. 4 of the Pañcasiddhāntikā.[1] II.1 gives the true sun, II. 2-6 give the computation of the true moon, III.4 gives a rule for the daily motion of the moon, II. 7 gives rules for the sun or moon's Nakṣatra and the Tithi and II.8-13 deal with topics related with the sun, like the duration of day-light, the length of the noon-shadow when the sun is known and *vice versa*, and lastly finding the Orient Ecliptic Point (Lagna) when the shadow is known and *vice versa*.

Obviously, the most important parts are II. 1, II. 2-6, and III. 4, which form the basis for the rest of the work. Also these parts are very interesting from a historical point of view. The methods given form a transition from the more ancient astronomy represented by the Paitāmaha Siddhānta condensed by Varāha, giving only mean sun and moon, to the later epicyclic astronomy represented by the Saura Siddhānta condensed by him. Of these, about II. 1, Dr. Thibaut (T) makes the remark, "a stanza of obscure import," and leaves it at that, without attempting to translate it, and Sudhakara Dvivedi (S) remarks:

"अनेन श्लोकेन किं साधयतीति न ज्ञायते, अत्यशुद्धत्वात्"

So much for the sun. About II. 2-6, T says (and S echoes him): "Of the above stanzas we have succeeded in making out the sense in part only. They manifestly teach how to find the mean and *perhaps also* the true positions of the moon by means of a process more compendious than the one usually employed in Indian Astronomy. What preliminary operation is presented in stanza 1, we are altogether unable to say.[2]...... It is not apparent why stanza 5 directs us to add for that

---

1. The references are to the Pañcasiddhāntikā edited by Dr. Thibaut and MM. Sudhakara Dvivedi and reprinted by Motilal Banarsi Das, Lahore, 1930.

2. Dr. Thibaut thinks that II.1 also deals with the moon, while it really deals with the sun.

half-gati six Signs plus four minutes to the moon's mean place, for the moon's mean motion in one half-gati amounts to considerably more, *viz.* six Signs plus about 92 minutes. Nor are we at present able to throw light upon the meaning of the processes prescribed in stanza 6. They possibly refer to the operation of finding the moon's true place, although we are more inclined to think that this latter part is treated in stanzas 4-9 of the next (*i.e.*, III) chapter." And S says : "गत्यर्धे कलाचतुष्टयसंस्कारस्य तथा ६-श्लोकस्य इदानींपर्यन्तं न बुद्धा उपपत्तिः" Thus T and S are both unaware that stanza 6 indeed gives the operation of finding the true moon. Further, their interpretation of II. 3-5 is wrong in several places, and by this they have shut out important necessary data. About III. 4 (including the next five stanzas as well), T remarks without being able to give any translation, "Six stanzas referring to the moon. The details, however, are obscure." About the same S says, "अन्येषां (i.e. 4-9) व्याख्यां अग्रे वक्ष्ये", and he has left it there without coming back to it.

In spite of this self-confessed ignorance, T remarks on p. li of his Introduction, "...the methods are so crude and so completely omit to distinguish between mean and true astronomical quantities that the Vāsiṣṭha Siddhānta can hardly be included within scientific Hindu Astronomy."

The Pañcasiddhāntikā was first printed in 1889 and during these nearly 70 years nobody, to my knowledge, has thrown light on the true nature of the Vāsiṣṭha Siddhānta.[1] In dealing with the topic in question, it is my desire also to discuss the readings of the text. We have only two manuscripts to go by, one badly vitiated and the other worse, both printed in the edition, one against the emended text and the other as footnotes. Frequent quotations from the Pañcasiddhāntikā are found in Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary of the Bṛhatsaṁhitā, but the range of our topic is limited, the whole thing taking only 14 āryās, and these are not found quoted anywhere, as

---

1. This is only one of many important topics in the Pañcasiddhāntikā needing enlightenment, like the Pauliśa sun, moon, solar eclipse, and 'star-planets', the last 18 āryās dealing with 'star-planets' and their authorship, etc., where T and S have either professed ignorance or gone wrong.

far as I know. But the subject-matter being scientific, it is possible to fix the correct text fairly well in most places of doubt, taking for our guidance the āryā-metre and the relics of the slaughtered words, provided we are certain of the intention of the author. I now proceed to the elucidation of the text. The understanding of the text everywhere comes first, as that is the basis for the correction of the text.[2]

The Sun.

II. 1.

कृतगुण यषमृतुयुतमैकर्तुम-	कृतगुणमृतुयुतमेक-
नुहृतं षड्यमेन्दुभिर्विभजेत् ।	र्तुमनुहृतं षड्यमेन्दुभिर्विभजेत् ।
शशिखखयमस्वरक्रत-	शशिखखयमकृतस्वर-
नवनववसुषट्कविषयोनैः ॥	नवनववसुषट्कविषयोनैः ॥

II. 1. The days from epoch (*Ahargaṇa*) are to be multiplied by 4 and 6 added to the product. This is to be divided by 1461 (and the remainder taken). From the remainder should be deducted successively 126 minus 1, 0, 0, 0, 2, 4, 7, 9, 9, 8, 6, 5 (*i.e.*, the twelve quantities 125, 126, 126, 126, 124, 122, 119, 117, 117, 118, 120, 121, are to be deducted successively). (The sun's Raśis, Meṣa etc., are successively got).

It is to be noted that Ahargaṇa is not mentioned, that we should take the remainder for the operation is not mentioned, and what we get by this rule is not given. We have to presume all these. The word Ahargaṇa can be easily understood, because that is the starting point of computation. The rule given, as also the numbers, point to the necessity of taking the remainder and to the true sun in Rāśis as the object of the operation.

The rule is explained as follows: The days from the epoch by being multiplied by 4 are converted into quarter-days. 6 quarter days are added to this because the beginning of the year (in this case the true year) is 1½ days before the epoch, and by the addition of the 6 quarter-days we get the total quarter-days from the beginning of the true year. According to this Siddhānta the year contains 365¼ days or 1461 quarter days. So by dividing out the total quarter days by 1461 and taking the remainder we get the quarter days from the begin-

2. The printed Ms. text is given on the left and my own emended text, opposite to it on the right. T's readings and the footnote readings are mentioned when necessary.

ning of the current year. During the first 125 quarter days (*i.e.*, 31¼ days) of the year the sun traverses the first Rāśi, *i.e.*, Meṣa. During the next 126 quarter days (*i.e.*, 31½ days) he crosses the second, *i.e.*, Ṛṣabha Rāśi, and so on. It is to be noted that there are 12 quantities for the 12 Rāśis, and that these add up to 1461. The sun's position within a Rāśi is expected to be found by proportion.

Thus if the days from epoch is 942, say, the quarter days from the beginning of the year just before the epoch is, $942 \times 4 + 6 = 3774$. Dividing out by 1461, we get 2 full solar years elapsed (which are not wanted,) and 852 quarter days are left over in the third year. We can take from this 125, 126, 126, 126, 124 and 122, and 103 quarter days are left over, *i.e.*, the sun has passed six full Rāśis, and in the seventh he has gone 103/119 parts or 26°.

At epoch, the sun is $6/125 \times 30° = 1°\ 26'$ in Meṣa, at sun-rise at Ujjain on Sunday, (near the end of śaka 427). What is the epoch, and how we are to find the days from epoch, these two things are not mentioned here. But ch. I. 8-13 give rules to find the days from epoch and we can adopt it, though given for Romaka and Pauliśa, for the interval between two points of time is invariant. Only we must take into account the time of day of epoch. Vāsiṣṭha epoch most probably is sun-rise at Ujjain, Sunday, at the end of śaka 427. This matter will be discussed subsequently.

Now we are in a position to discuss the adopted readings. T and S, because they have not understood the stanza, have simply corrected the obvious scriptory errors, and so far as they go, they are correct. The text-reading यषमृतु has been corrected into षड्ऋतु, following the variant reading षट्कतु. युतमैकर्तुं is corrected into युतमेकर्तुं. स्वरक्रत is corrected as स्वरकृत. I have made the following further corrections: (1) षड् has been deleted and only ऋतु retained, because the first foot clearly ends with मेकर्, and there are two mātrās extra. It is better षड् is omitted because one Ms. has it, the other having a corruption, यष. But both Mss. have ऋतु. (2) In the third foot, I have interchanged स्वरकृत and made it कृतस्वर, because order requires it. There must be a gradual and continuous fall from 126 to 117. The values indeed must have been obtained empirically, but it is too much to assume that the

Siddhānta was not aware of the gradual nature of the fall and rise and gave what it saw as स्वरकृत. The error of observation also would be too great if it is स्वरकृत.

The Moon.

II. 2-6.

रसगुणनवेन्दुयुक्त	2. रसगुणनवेन्दुयुक्ते
शशिगुणखगुणोद्धृतेघ्नताद्युगणे ।	शशिगुणखगुणोद्धृते घना द्युगणे ।
शेषे नवभिर्गुणिते	शेषे नवभिर्गुणिते
गतयोऽष्टजिनैः पदं शेषं ॥	गतयोऽष्टजिनैः पदं शेषम् ॥
घन [षोडश] हृतं शेषं	3. धन[षोडश]हृतशेषं
प्रोज्झ्याद्यस्त्रिगुणितं चतुर्भक्तं ।	प्रोज्झयाधस्त्रिगुणितं चतुर्भक्तम् ।
भादिकलाद्विगुणघ्ना	भादि कला द्विगुणघना
शशिमुनिनवयमाश्वराशाद्या ॥	शशिमुनिनवयमाश्व राश्याद्याः ॥
विषयधृतयो गतिघ्ना	4. विषयधृतयो गतिघ्ना
गततिषष्टांशोनिता कलाः प्रोक्ताः ।	गतिकाष्ठांशोनिताः कलाः प्रोक्ताः ।
वेदार्काः पादसंख्या	वेदार्काः पदसंख्या
गत्यर्धे धनमृणं परतः ॥	गत्यर्धे धनमृणं परतः ॥
गत्यर्धे भगणार्धे	5. गत्यर्धे भगणार्धे
देयं लिप्ताश्चतुष्कसंयुक्तं ।	देयं लिप्ताचतुष्कसंयुक्तम् ।
शेषपदसमाश्वांशा-	शेषपदसमाश्वांशा-
स्तश्च धनर्णात् फलं दन्त्यं ॥	स्तैश्च धनर्णात् फलं देयम् ॥
व्येकपदमिन्द्रियघ्नं	6. व्येकपदमिन्द्रियघ्नं
कृतनवदशसंयुतं वियुक्तं च ।	कृतनवदशसंयुतं वियुक्तं च ।
मनुवेदयमेभ्यः पद-	मनुवेदयमेभ्यः पद-
गुणे त्रिषष्टयो धृते लिप्ता ॥	गुणे त्रिषष्टयोद्धृते लिप्ताः ॥

III. 4.

नगात् पदाद्दशघ्नात्	[वि] नवात् पदाद्दशघ्नात्
सप्तांशः सश्वि सांवरोभुक्तिः ।	सप्तांशः साश्विखस्वरो भुक्तिः ।
गत्यर्द्धान्ता छोध्यो	गत्यर्धान्ताच्छोध्यो
लिप्ताभ्यो वसुमुनिनवभ्यः ॥	लिप्ताभ्यो नवमुनिवसुभ्यः ॥

II. 2. 1936 is added to the days from epoch and the total divided by 3031. The quotient are called Ghanas. The remainder is to be multiplied by 9 and divided by 248. The quotient are called Gatis. The remainder all called Padas.

II. 3. The Ghanas are to be divided by 16 and the remainder taken. This should be multiplied by 3 and divided by 4. This is Rāśi etc. It should be deducted from 12 Rāśis (and the remainder written down). Minutes of arc equal to twice the total Ghanas (are to be added). One Rāśi, 7 degrees and 29 minutes are (also to be added).

II. 4. 185 multiplied by the Gatis minus a tenth of the Gatis are minutes (which are also to be added). The (first) 124 Padas are designated a half-gati. (If the Padas are less than 124) they are called plus-padas. If more than 124, 124 is taken from it to form a half-gati, and the remainder are called minus-padas.

II. 5. If there is a half-gati, (for the sake of that half-gati) 6 Rāśis and 4 minutes are to be added. Also degrees equal in number to the plus-padas or minus-padas (are to be added). With these plus or minus padas respectively, the minutes got by the plus operation or minus operation respectively (in II. 6) are to be added.

II. 6. Deduct one from the plus-pada or minus-pada, and multiply this by 5. (If plus-pada) add the product to 1094, multiply the sum by the plus-pada, and divide by 63. The resulting minutes (are to be added). If minus-pada, the product is to be subtracted from 2414, the remainder multiplied by the minus-pada, and divided by 63. The resulting minutes (are to be added). (Thus the true moon is got.)

III. 4. Deduct 9 from the number of plus or minus Padas, multiply this by 10 and divide by 7. Add this to 702 if plus-padas. Deduct this from 879 if minus-padas. The resulting minutes are the daily motion (for the day ending with the padas).

The following is the explanation of the process. The true moon at a given time t is (i) the mean moon at t plus (ii) the equation of the centre for t. (i) is given here in five parts. We shall call them a, b, c, d, e, which are to be added up to get the total mean moon. a (usually called the Mūla-dhruva) is the mean moon at a point of time 1936 days before the epoch, when the moon's apogee and the mean moon exactly coincided, according to this Siddhānta. This is given as शशिमुनिनवयमाश्च राश्याद्याः *i.e.*, 1 Rāśi, 7 degrees, 29 minutes. b is the mean motion during whole numbers of cycles of 3031 days,

each cycle equal to 110 anomalistic revolutions of the moon, from that point of time. This b is found by multiplying the mean motion per cycle (110 revolutions, 11 Rāśis, 7 degrees, 32 minutes) by the number of cycles, called Ghanas, obtained as quotient by dividing the Ahargaṇa plus 1936 days, by 3031. As full revolutions may be neglected, it is enough if we multiply the Ghanas by 11 Rāśis 7 degrees 32 minutes, which may be done as Ghanas $\times 2' +$ Ghanas $\times 11^R\, 7^\circ 30'$. Ghanas $\times 2'$ is given by द्विगुणघनाः कलाः (योज्याः). Because 16 Ghanas $\times\ 11^R\, 7^\circ\, 30'$ equals 15 full revolutions, it is enough if we divide out the Ghanas by 16 and take the reminder alone for multiplication, which we are asked to do by घनषोडशाहृतशेषम्. As $11^R\, 7^\circ\, 30'$ is $\frac{3}{4}$ Rāsi less than a full revolution, we can multiply the remaining Ghanas by $\frac{3}{4}$ Rāśi and take this as subtractive, which we are instructed to do by प्रोज्झ्याधस्त्रिगुणितं चतुर्भक्तं भादि. Thus b is disposed of. c is the mean motion during the subsequent full anomalistic revolutions called Gatis, which form the quotient got by dividing the remaining days by the anomalistic period 248/9 days; (multiplying the days by 9 and dividing by 248 is only dividing by 248/9). For each Gati the mean motion is 1 revolution and $184\frac{9}{10}$ minutes. Hence the rule to multiply the Gatis by 185′ and deduct minutes equal to 1/10 of the Gatis. This is given by विषयधृतयो गतिघ्ना गतिकाष्ठांशोनिताः कलाः (योज्याः). What are now left over are 9ths of days called Padas (and these obviously would be less than 248). The mean motion per pada is $1^\circ\, 27'.842$ and so Padas $\times\ 1^\circ\, 27'.842$ should be added to complete the mean motion till t. Of this the Siddhānta asks us to add 1 per Pada first, which is given by शेषपदसमाश्चांशाः (योज्याः). This forms d. The residue $27'.842$ per Pada forming e is combined with the equation of the centre (ii) and given by the two equations of II.6. If the Padas contain a half-gati, the value of $d+e+$(ii) for the half-gati part are combined together and given as $180^\circ\ 4'$. This $180^\circ\ 4'$ is got as follows: The half-gati is equal to 124 padas. So $d=124^\circ$. $e+$(ii) given by the equation is $\{1094+5\ (124\text{-}1)\}\, 124/63 = 3364' = 56^\circ 4'$; $124^\circ + 56^\circ 4' = 180^\circ\, 4'$. Thus it is that we get $180^\circ\ 4'$ for a half-gati, given by गत्यर्धे भगणार्धं देयं लिप्ताचतुष्कसंयुक्तम्, which instruction has so much puzzled *T* and *S*. But of course this is incorrect and the defect lies in the equation of the centre part of the formulae in

II.6, which give the zero value for the equation of the centre not at 124 Padas but at 133 Padas, as I shall show presently.

I shall first explain II. 6, and show how the formulae here combine the residual mean motion, *viz.* Padas $\times$ $27'.842$ $(=e)$ with what is identifiable with the equation of the centre (=ii). If P=plus or minus Padas, the formula for plus-padas can be written down as $\{1094 + 5(P-1)\} P/63$, and the formula for minus-padas as, $\{2414 - 5(P-1)\} P/63$. Let us first take the plus-pada formula. As we have said $e +$ (ii)$=\{1094+5(P-1)\}P/63$, and $e = 27'{\cdot}842\,P$.

$$\text{Therefore (ii)} = \{1094 + 5(P-1)\} P/63 - 27'{\cdot}842\,P$$
$$= (1089 + 5P)\,P/63 - 63 \times 27'{\cdot}842\,P/63$$
$$= (1089 - 1754 + 5P)\,P/63$$
$$= (5P - 665)\,P/63$$

Taking the minus-pada formula,

$$\text{(ii)} = \{2414 - 5(P-1)\} P/63 - 27'{\cdot}842\,P$$
$$= (2419 - 5P)\,P/63 - 63 \times 27'{\cdot}842\,P/63$$
$$= (2419 - 1754 - 5P)\,P/63$$
$$= (665 - 5P)\,P/63$$

Now, the plus-padas representing the original Padas lying within 0 to 124 Padas, correspond to the anomaly lying between 0 and 180°. The minus-padas correspond to the anomaly lying between 180° and 360°. So for the plus-pada the equation of the centre must be negative.[1] We see, $(5P - 665)\,P/63$ is indeed negative for all values of plus-pada, and $(665 - 5P)\,P/63$ is positive for all values of minus-pada. It is to be noted that the one is the negative of the other. Again, the former starts from the value 0 for $P = 0$, gradually goes to a minimum for $P = 66\frac{1}{2}$, and again gradually, increases reaching 0 for $P = 133$, (but P stops with 124), while the latter starting from O value for $P = 0$, goes to a maximum for $P=66\frac{1}{2}$ and falls gradually to 0 in a similar manner. Thus the equations roughly behave like the term of the equation of the centre of modern astronomy, $-k \sin\theta$, and therefore identifiable with the equation of the centre. This is noteworthy, as forming a transition from a stage of

1. Negative, because unlike in modern astronomy, moon minus apogee is taken as anomaly. This is the practice in Hindu astronomy.

no equation of the centre to the stage of epicyclic astronomy giving the equation of the centre in the form, $-k \sin \theta$. Substituting 66½ for P we get the maximum or minimum equation of the centre $\pm$ 351′.[1]

I now proceed to the explanation of III. 4, giving the formulae for the daily motion. They can be written down thus: For plus-padas, $702' + 10' \ (P-9)/7$. For minus-padas, $879' - 10' \ (P-9)/7$. We see, these being linear equations, that the increase or decrease in the daily motion is uniform, from 702′ to 879′ and back again from 879′ to 702′. 702′ is the minimum and 879′ is the maximum, the former being 88′. 5 less and the latter 88′. 5 more[2] than the mean motion 790′·6. Though mathematically we can get values less than 702′ and more than 879′ for P less than 9, this is not envisaged by the Siddhānta. I shall now derive these rules from those of II. 6 and thus show that these belong to Vāsiṣṭha, to whatever other Siddhānta also they belong.

The daily motion for the day ending P padas is clearly the true moon for P minus the true moon for $(P-9)$. So for plus-padas the daily motion is,

$$\left[a + b + c + P^\circ + \left\{1094 + 5\ (P-1)\right\} P/63\right] -$$

$$\left[a + b + c + (P-9)^\circ + \left\{1094 + 5\ (P-1-9)\right\} (P-9)/63\right]$$

(*in minutes*)

$$= 540 + 1089\, P/63 + 5\, P^2/63 - 1089\ (P-9)/63 - 5\ (P-9)^2/63$$

$$= 540 + 1089\ (P-9+9)/63 + 5\ (P-9+9)^2/63 - 1089\ (P-9)/63 - 5\ (P-9)^2/63$$

$$= 540 + 1089 \times 9/63 + 5 \times 9^2/63 + 90\ (P-9)/63$$

$$= 540 + 162 + 10\ (P-9)/7$$

$$= 702 + 10\ (P-9)/7.$$

In the same way for the minus-padas,

$$\left[a + b + c + P^\circ + \left\{2414 - 5\ (P-1)\right\} P/63\right] -$$

---

1. Note how close this is to the modern value, 377′, and how different from the circa $\pm$ 301′ of later Hindu astronomy.

2. Modern astronomy gives $\pm$ 86′ on the average. See how the Vāsiṣṭha value $\pm$ 88½ is far better than the $\pm$ 68′ of later Hindu astronomy.

$$\left[a+b+c+(P-9)^\circ+\left\{2414-5\,(P-1-9)\right\}(P-9)/63\right]$$

(*in minutes*)

$$= 540 + 2419\,P/63 - 5\,P^2/63 - 2419\,(P-9)/63 + 5\,(P-9)^2/63$$
$$= 540 + 2419\,(P-9+9)/63 - 5\,(P-9+9)^2/63 - 2419\,(P-9)/63 + 5\,(P-9)^2/63$$
$$= 540 + 2419 \times 9/63 - 5 \times 9^2/63 - 90\,(P-9)/63$$
$$= 540 + 339 - 10\,(P-9)/7$$
$$= 879 - 10\,(P-9)/7.$$

It is also possible to establish the connection, by summing the two expressions of III. 4 and arriving at the formulae of II. 6. For the matter of that, there are reasons to surmise that II. 6 was got from III. 4 by summation. The difference from the mean position must have been first noticed. This must have been accounted for by a variation in the motion from a minimum to a maximum and *vice versa*, postulating the variation to be constant as in III. 4. The factor (P—9) must have been introduced because the minimum 702′ must be obtained for the first day ending 9 Padas, and so on for the others (though $P-4\frac{1}{2}$ would have done better). Then by summation, formulae II. 6 must have been got. That is why the 0 value of the equation of the centre results for 133 padas instead of 124, and for a half-gati we get 180° 4′ instead of the correct 181° 32′. Otherwise, it is easy to have given the 0 value for 124 padas, and the maximum or minimum for 62 padas, by making the equation of the centre formulae equal to $\pm\,(5P-620)\,P/63$, and combining these with 27′·842 P. The factor $(P-1)$ in the formulae of II. 6, seems to form a relic of a prior summation, which Varāha seems to have retained out of respect for the original Siddhānta, for the same result will be got by the more simplified forms, $(1089+5P)\,P/63$ and $(2419-5P)\,P/63$.

I shall now point out some of the errors committed by *T* and *S*. They have seriously gone wrong in their interpretation of the second half of II. 3, and this after making two uncalled for emendations of the Ms. text. (See discussion of the text). In this part, as we have already seen, we are asked to add minutes equal to twice the Ghanas, and also add the Mūla-dhruva, (or Kṣepa), 1 Rāśi 7° 29′. *T* and *S* interpret it as, "Multiply the Ghanas by 2 and divide by 2971. The resulting Rāśis etc. are to be added." This means, instead of 2′ per Ghana we add 1′ 13″, and we do not add the

Kṣepa 1 Rāśi 7° 29′ at all. As for the 1′ 13″, this is unwarranted when both the Mss. say 2′ per Ghana. An emendation is called for only when a quantity given is so far removed from the actual that it is *not likely to be the quantity given by the Siddhānta.* Now the value 2′ agrees better with the mean motion (siderial) per Ghana, *viz.* 110 revolutions 11 Rāśis 7° 32′ 33″·5 given by modern astronomy. It agrees almost perfectly with the value of Siddhānta Śiromaṇi of Bhāskara II. While it is a matter for wonder and admiration how the ancient Vāsiṣṭha achieved a thing not achieved by most later Siddhāntas, *T* and *S* come in and spoil the whole thing by their emendations.

As for the Kṣepa which *T* and *S* have obliterated, it is essential, as it supplies the Mūladhruva. This can be seen from the mean moon I give according to different systems for sun-set at Yavanapura (Alexandria), *i.e.*, for 37 nāḍis, 20 vināḍis after mean sun-rise at Ujjain, Sunday, close to the end of śaka 427.

Modern astronomy (this from the Vernal equinox of epoch)	354° 48′
Vāsiṣṭha (*with the Kṣepa,* taking Ujjain sunrise for the Vāsiṣṭha epoch)	355° 6′
Vāsiṣṭha (*without the Kṣepa,* taking Ujjain sunrise for the Vāsiṣṭha epoch)	317° 37′
Siddhānta Śiromaṇi	355° 49′
Romaka	356° 12′
Saura (with Ujjain noon for epoch, given)	355° 6′
Vāsiṣṭha (*with the Kṣepa,* taking Ujjain 37-20 nāḍikās for epoch for Vāsiṣṭha also)	346° 54′
Vāsiṣṭha (*without the Kṣepa,* taking Ujjain 37-20 nāḍikās for Vāsiṣṭha epoch also)	309° 25′

We see that with the Kṣepa intact Vāsiṣṭha mean moon agrees with the other Siddhāntas and modern astronomy. With the Kṣepa gone, there is a defect of 37°.

Incidentally we must discuss another point here, *viz.* what time of the day is the Vāsiṣṭha epoch. Varāha gives different times of day for different Siddhāntas, and sometimes even for the same Siddhānta. For the Saura sun, moon, moon's apogee and Rāhu, midday at Ujjain (Sunday) is given as time of epoch, and for the planets the midnight

following. For the Paitāmaha the time of day of epoch is morning (though the year is different). For the Romaka the epoch time of day is sunset at Yavanapura (Alexandria) which is equal to 37 nāḍikās 20 vināḍikās from sunrise at Ujjain (Sunday), excepting for the moon's apogee, for which sunset at Ujjain is given as the time. In the case of the Pauliśa the time is not mentioned, unless we strain नातिचिरे पौलिशेऽप्येवम् (I. 10) a bit, and make it mean that the Pauliśa time of epoch also is sunset at Yavanapura like the Romaka. But we can infer that it is indeed so, from III. 13-15. For the Vāsiṣṭha also the time is not mentioned. Is it sunset at Yavanapura, because it has been given as a general instruction? Or is it sunrise at Ujjain, as in the Paitāmaha? If it is sunrise at Ujjain, the Vāsiṣṭha moon agrees closely with those of other Siddhāntas as also modern astronomy. If it is sunset at Yavanapura it is defective by about 8°. (If the Kṣepa is not taken into account the defect will be about 45°). Now 8° difference is too much, especially when we consider the accuracy of the Vāsiṣṭha moon's mean motion. So the time of day of the epoch for Vāsiṣṭha must be mean sunrise at Ujjain (Sunday). VI. 1 lends support to this, for there an operation is performed on the sun, which must be the sun at sunrise, and VI. 1 is Vāsiṣṭha's.

We shall now continue our main discussion. In their interpretation of II. 4-5 also, *T* and *S* have fallen into material errors. In II. 4, two terms, plus-padas and minus-padas are defined, to be used in II. 6, which have been missed by them.

In II. 5 *T's* translation wants us to add degrees equal to the number of Padas, only in the case of the Padas left over after deducting 124, *i.e.*, in the case of what amounts to the minus-padas only. On the other hand this applies to the plus-padas as well. But *S's* commentary gives the correct interpretation. In the second part of this stanza, *T's* translation is non-committal. *S's* interpretation is positively erroneous. He says:

"अर्थात् वेदार्काल्पपदेषु ऋणम्, अधिकेषु धनमिति बुद्धिमद्भिः स्वयमेवोह्यम्".

i.e., if the original padas are less than 124, the result of II. 6 is subtractive, if more than 124 additive. Evidently

he thinks that II. 6 gives the equation of the centre, pure and simple, and it must be subtractive for padas less than 124 and additive otherwise. But as I have already explained, there are two rules in II. 6, the first requiring the addition of two terms, and the second requiring a subtraction of one term from another. In the first, Padas less than 124 are to be used, and in the second the Padas remaining after deducting 124 are to be used. But the result of either rule is to be added to the mean moon so far obtained. There is no question of subtraction here at all.

As for II. 6, *T* and *S* have said in so many words they do not understand it, but nevertheless given an interpretation which naturally is wrong. III. 4, they have not touched.

Now we are in a position to discuss the readings of II. 2-6 and III. 4.

In II. 2 there are the scriptory errors, युक्तशाशिगुण for युक्ते शाशिगुण ; and घता for घना, which *T* and *S* have corrected. I have adopted these corrections.

In II. 3, the scribal errors घन for घन, हृतं शेषं for हृतशेषं, घस्त्रिगुणितं for घस्त्रिगुणितं, घना for घना, and श्वराशाद्या for श्व राश्याद्याः, which *T* and *S* have corrected I have adopted. *T* and *S* have corrected प्रोज्ज्य into प्रोह्य, while I have made it प्रोज्झ्य, as giving the sense better and also more likely. There is a broken part in the Ms. text which *T* has correctly guessed as षोडश and printed within brackets, and I have adopted this.

Apart from these small errors the Ms. is alright. But *T* and *S* have carried out two uncalled for emendations which seriously affect the subject matter. The first is the changing of कला into फलं (when both Mss. give कला), simply because if the second emendation is made, कला would be troublesome. The second is the conversion of शशिमुनिनवयमाश्व into शशिमुनिनवयमहृताश्व, when neither Ms. has हृत, and the āryā metre is sinned against by the addition of the two mātrās, thus giving 18 mātrās to the fourth foot and making it a Gīti, which Varāha nowhere uses in his text.[1] Further they have

---

1. The one mātrā extra as it is, is excusable according to some commentators on Prosody. Or else, राश्याद्या must be read as राश्यादि.

done this thinking they are improving the text. On the other hand they have spoiled the already correct and better text and also shut out a necessary data (*viz.*, the Mūladhruva), as we have shown before.

In II. 4, *T* and *S* have corrected निता कलाः into निताः कलाः, which I have also done. Metre requires that पादसंख्या must be changed into पदसंख्या and पद will be a better word also. *T* and *S* have failed to notice this, and retained पादसंख्या. षष्टांश, (a likely corruption for षष्ठांश or षष्ट्यंश) does not agree with the value given for the Ghana, and *T* and *S* have rightly amended it into काष्ठांश. *T* and *S* have corrected परतः into पदतः not understanding the text properly, and परतः may stand.

In II. 5 लिप्ताश्चतुष्क for लिप्ताचतुष्क, समाश्वांशाः for समाश्चांशाः, तश्च for तैश्च, and दन्त्यं for देयं are all scribal errors corrected by *T* and *S* and adopted by me. In II. 6, षष्ट्यो घृते for षष्ट्योद्घृते is the only error, and that scribal. *T* and *S* have made the correction and I have taken it.

In III. 4, गत्यर्धान्ताछोध्यो for गत्यर्धान्ताच्छोध्यो is a scribal error corrected by *T* and *S* and adopted by me. As for सश्विसांवरो corrected by *T* and *S* into साश्विखाचला, साश्विखाचलो is a better correction, as retaining the ओ at the end. The masculine gender that results is not ungrammatical, for making the word qualify सप्तांशः is better than making it qualify भुक्तिः. An alternate correction would be साश्विखस्वरो which seems to be better still as it retains वरो (रो is given by both Mss.) instead of making it चलो, and I have adopted this. All three readings give 702 which is required in the formula.

नगात् and वसुमुनिनवभ्यः being apparently correct, *T* and *S* have not touched it, which is what all they could have done, because they have refrained from interpreting the stanza, saying the meaning is obscure. But both need correction. First we shall take up नगात्. A mātrā is wanting in the foot. I have shown the rules here are derivable from II. 6. The rules require Padas minus nine to be used. So I have made नगात् पदात् into विनवात् पदात्, which gives the required meaning, वि supplying the wanting mātrā. As for वसुमुनिनवभ्यः, the

second rule requires 879, and the numbers are given in the wrong order by the Ms. text. So I have emended it into नवमुनिवसुभ्य:

Tithi and Nakṣatra

III. 7

शशादलं त्रिकृतिघ्नमृ-	शश्यर्धदलं त्रिकृति-
क्षमंशस्छिता मुहूर्त्ता स्युः ।	घ्नमृक्षमंशस्थिता मुहूर्तास्स्युः ।
व्यर्केन्दुदलं विषया-	व्यर्केन्दुदलं विषया-
हतं तिथिस्तद्वदेवोक्तः ॥	हतं तिथिस्तद्वदेवोक्तः ॥

III. 7. The quarter part of the true moon multiplied by 9 gives the Nakṣatra (in the Rāśi column) and what is in the degree column are the Muhūrtas. Half the sun minus moon multiplied by 5 gives the Tithis, in the same manner, (*i.e.*, in the Rāśi column, and 30ths of Tithis in the degree column).

The rules are simple and based on the fact that there are $2\frac{1}{4}$ Nakṣatras for a Rāśi, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ Tithis. Two things are noteworthy here. The word Muhūrta now only a measure of time (through the time of staying of the moon in a Nakṣatra being used as a measure of time) is used for the 30th of a Nakṣatra segment. Even as applied to the 30th part of the duration of a Nakṣatra, it is different from the period of 2 Nāḍikās, in which sense it is usually used.

Now for the text: The scriptory errors शस्छिता for शस्थिता and मुहूर्त्ता स्युः for मुहूर्तास्स्युः are corrected by *T* and *S* and I have adopted their correction. शशादलं in the Ms. is corrupt and has been emended into शश्यर्धदलं by *T* and *S* because the rule requires it and two mātrās are wanting. Also, the foot should end with त्रिकृति. I have adopted their emendation. राश्यर्धदलं would be an alternate emendation, which would extend the scope of the Nakṣatra rule to the sun as well.

Daylight

II. 8

मकरादौ गुणयुक्तो	मकरादौ गुणयुक्तो
मेखादौ तिथियुतोरवेर्दिवसः ।	मेषादौ तिथियुतो रविर्दिवसः ।
कर्कटकादिषु सत्सु	कर्कटकादिषु षट्सु
त्रयस्त्रिकाः शर्वरीमानम् ॥	त्रयस्त्रिकाः शर्वरीमानम् ॥

II. 8. When the sun is from Makara etc. (upto Meṣa) the sun (in Rāśis) plus 3 is the duration of daytime (in Muhūrtas). When the sun is from Meṣa etc. (upto Karkaṭa), the sun plus 15 is the duration of daytime. When the sun is in the 6 Rāśis from Karkaṭa, the sun plus 9, is the measure of the night-time.

The rule is easy to understand. According to this Siddhānta the shortest daytime is 12 Muhūrtas (i.e., 24 Nāḍikās), which occurs when the sun is at the beginning of Makara. The longest day is 18 Muhūrtas with the sun at the beginning of Karkaṭa. Between Makara and Karkaṭa, there is increase in daylight in Muhūrtas equal to the motion of the sun in Rāśis, and from Karkaṭa to Makara, there is increase of the night-time in the same manner.

It is to be noted that the rule gives the same result as the Paitāmaha Siddhānta and the Vedāṅga Jyautiṣa, with this difference that here the variation of daylight is with the true sun. It is also to be noted that really the daylight increases or decreases not with the sun as given here, but with the tangent of the declination of the sun. The maximum-minimum daylight given points to the extreme north of India, lat. 34° 45′.

Now, the meaning easily follows with two small changes made in the text, रविः for रवेः and षट्सु for सत्सु (which latter *T* and *S* have also made). But not understanding the stanza (or perhaps finding it disagreeing with II. 9-10) *T* and *S* have made a drastic change in the text, viz., भूस्वर्गतितिथिमितो for मेषादौ तिथियुतो. The letters of भूस्वर्गति are quite unrelated with the letters in मेषादौ. I cannot understand how भूस्वर्गतितिथि means 1591, *i.e.* how स्वर्गति means 9. (It is not a mis-print, for the commentary also uses the expression.) Again त्रयस्त्रिकाः is taken to mean three by three, while it can only mean three threes, *i.e.*, 9. Even if we allow these things, the meaning given by them is self-condemnatory. At the rate of 3 palas a day the measure of the day is 1865 palas when the sun is at the beginning of Meṣa, and 2139 when the sun is at the beginning of Karkaṭa, which means the night is 1461 palas; and this disagrees with 1591, because the duration of the day at Makarādi is the duration of the night at Karkaṭādi. The equinoxes according to this interpretation would occur 22 days before the sun reaches Meṣa and 22 days after he

leaves Kanyā, *i.e.*, from Vernal equinox to Autumnal equinox, there would be 226 days and from Autumnal equinox to Vernal equinox, there would be 139 days !!

I have incidentally discussed the readings here. One remains, मेखादौ, which I have changed into मेषादौ as ख being written for ष is common in certain parts of India.

The noon-day shadow and the Sun.

II. 9-10

कर्कटादिषु भुक्तं	कर्कटकादिषु भुक्त
द्विगुणं मध्यंदिनी भवेछाया ।	द्विगुणं माध्यन्दिनी भवेच्छाया ।
मकरादिषु चाप्येव	मकरादिषु चाप्येवं
किं चस्मिन्मण्डला छोध्यं ॥	किन्त्वस्मिन् मण्डलाच्छोध्यम् ॥
मध्याह्नछायार्धं	मध्याह्नच्छायार्धं
सत्रिभमर्कोऽयने भवेद्याम्ये ।	सत्रिभमर्कोऽयने भवेद्याम्ये ।
उदगयने संशोध्यं	उदगयने संशोध्यं
पंचदशभ्यो रविर्भवति ॥	पञ्चदशभ्यो रविर्भवति ॥

II. 9. When (the Sun is) in the (6) Rasis beginning with Karkaṭa, the number of Rāśis passed beginning with Karkaṭa, multiplied by 2, is the noon-shadow (in Aṅgulis). The same (rule should be followed) when (the Sun is) in the (6) Rāśis from Makara. But in this case the result is to be deducted from 12 Rāśis (to get the shadow).

II. 10. When the Sun is in the south-ward course, (*i.e.* in the 6 Rāśis from Karkaṭa), half the noon-shadow plus three Rāśis is the Sun (in Rāśis etc.). When he is in the north-ward course, (*i.e.* in the 6 Rāśis from Makara) half the noon-shadow is to be subtracted from 15 and the sun is got.

It is supposed that the shadow increases proportionately with the Sun from a starting value zero at the beginning of Karkaṭa. At the beginning of Makara the maximum, 12 aṅgulis, is reached. Then it decreases as it increases, and comes back to zero at the beginning of Karkaṭa. The length of the gnomon is not mentioned, but most probably it is 12 aṅgulis, commonly given in Hindu astronomy. Zero at the beginning of Karkaṭa would give about 24° Lat. to the region where the rule holds, and 12 aṅgulis maximum would give 21°. Thus there is contradiction within the stanza itself. This

contradiction may be resolved by taking the gnomon as 11 angulis, but this is not likely. Neither of these agrees with Lat. 34° 45′ got from the maximum and minimum daylight. The uniform variation is wrong, which means that the rule is not based on observation even at intervals. Therefore, the rules must have been taken from different sources and pieced together, and the remark of Brahmagupta, एतानेव गृहीत्वा वासिष्ठो विष्णुचन्द्रेण (कृतः कन्थाः) seems to hold here. II. 10 is the reverse of II. 9.

As for the readings, कर्कटादिषु for कर्कटकादिषु, मध्यंदिनी for माध्यन्दिनी, भवेछाया for भवेच्छाया, वाप्येव for चाप्येवं, मण्डलाछोध्यं for मण्डलाच्छोध्यं are scribal errors corrected by *T* and *S*, and adopted by me. *T* and *S* have corrected किं चस्मिन् into किं चास्मिन्, while I have made it किन्त्वस्मिन because तु is better for the meaning than च, and the likelihood is greater. All this in II. 9. There is no error in II. 10, worth the name.

Lagna from shadow and shadow from Lagna.

द्वाशभिः स छायै-	11. द्वादशाभिः सच्छायै-
र्मध्याह्नोनैर्भजेद्रसजताशं ।	र्मध्याह्नोनैर्भजेद्रसहुताशम् ।
अपराह्ने चन्द्राद्धां-	अपराह्ने चक्रार्धा-
द्विशोध्य सार्कं भवति लग्नं ॥	द्विशोध्य सार्कं भवति लग्नम् ॥
व्यर्कें लग्ने लिप्ताः	12. व्यर्के लग्ने लिप्ताः
प्राक्यश्चा छोधितास्तु चक्राद्धात् ।	प्राक् पश्चाच्छोधितास्तु चक्रार्धात् ।
कायछेदः शून्यां	कार्यश्छेदः शून्या-
वराष्टलवणोदषट्कानां ॥	म्बराष्टलवणोदषट्कानाम् ॥
लध्वं द्वादशहीनं	13. लब्धं द्वादशहीनं
मध्याह्नछायया समायुक्तं ।	मध्याह्नच्छायया समायुक्तम् ।
सा विज्ञेया छाया	सा विज्ञेया छाया
वासिष्टसमाससिद्धान्ते ॥	वासिष्ठसमाससिद्धान्ते ॥

II. 11. The shadow at any moment is to be added to 12 and the noon-shadow (of date) is to be deducted from that. By this, 36 is to be divided. This result is to be added to the Sun in Rāśis to get the Lagna, (*i.e.* Orient Ecliptic Point) (if it is forenoon). If afternoon, the result is to be subtracted from 6 Rāśis and this added to the Sun to get the Lagna.

II. 12-13. The sun is to be deducted from the Lagna and the remainder converted into minutes of are, if it is forenoon. If afternoon, the remainder should be deducted from 6 Rāśis and then converted into minutes. 64800 is to be divided by the minutes. The result is to be added to the noon-shadow (of date) and 12 deducted from this. This is the shadow (at the time of the given Lagna).

This according to the brief Vāsiṣṭha Siddhānta.

Rule II. 11 can be explained as follows. (There is no question of proving it because it is rough and has been constructed empirically, its justification being its serviceability). As in the case of the rough rules current to find the time of the day from the shadow, and because Lagna follows the time roughly, the equation for Lagna, elapsed after sunrise or to elapse till sun-set can be expressed in the form, $a/(s+b)=L$ where a and b are constants, and s is a function of the shadow. If as a first approximation we take the latitude of the place as zero, and the ecliptic as coinciding with the celestial equator, it follows that there is a rise of 3 lagnas from sun-rise to noon, and 3 more from noon to sunset, that at noon, when $L = 3$, the shadow is zero, and that midway between sunrise and noon L is $1\frac{1}{2}$, and the shadow then is 12 tan 45°, *i.e.* 12. If really there is no such uniform rise of Lagna, and noon does not correspond to rise of 3 lagnas, but a little more or less, it is because the latitude may not be zero, and the ecliptic does not coincide with the celestial equator. These would also cause shadow at noon where otherwise there would be no shadow, and make the shadow at other times differ correspondingly. Now it is supposed that by deducting the noon-shadow from the shadow the first mentioned ideal condition is established (because then s would become zero for noon and the difference in the shadow at other times would be roughly righted). So it is thought that by taking the shadow minus noon-shadow instead of the shadow itself, everything would be all right (though strictly they would not be). So we may write "shadow minus noon-shadow" for s. As its value, as we have already shown is O for $L=3$, and 12 for $L=1\frac{1}{2}$, we have the two equations $a/(O+b)=3$, $a/(12+b)=1\frac{1}{2}$, to determine a and b; from which we obtain $a=36$, and $b=12$. Thus we get the expression 36/(shadow minus noon-shadow+12) as the value of the Lagna elapsed from sun-rise in the forenoon, and the Lagna to elapse till sunset in the afternoon. As at sun-

rise, the longitude of the sun is the Lagna, this is to be added to the sun. As at sunset the longitude of the sun plus 6 Rāśis is the Lagna, the result is deducted from the sun plus 6 Rāśis, or which is the same, deducted from 6 Rāśis and the sun added. Thus the rule is explained. T's statement in his explanation, " In order to establish a workable proportion...... 12 is added to the first and to the third members......", makes the rule appear more arbitrary than necessary.

The rule II. 12-13 is the inverse operation of the rule II. 11 and that explains it. But because the divisor which is in Rāśis in II. 11, is converted into minutes here, the dividend, 36, is multiplied by the number of minutes in a Rāśi and given as 64800.

One thing is to be noted. II. 12-13 can only serve as a mathematical exercise as it is, for no rule has been given by the Siddhānta for the Lagna other than by using the shadow, and if the Lagna is got from the shadow, what is the meaning of getting the shadow back from the Lagna? At night the Lagna can be got by observation, but then there will be no shadow caused by the sun, to which alone the rule applies.

The concluding word, "वाशिष्ठसमाससिद्धान्ते", though forming a part of the last sentence giving the rule II. 12-13, may be taken to mean the whole of chapter II, and even III. 4, which we have shown to be Vāsiṣṭha's.

Now for the readings: the scribal errors द्वाशभिः for द्वादशभिः, स छायैः for सच्छायैः, रसजतांशं for रसहुतांशं, चन्द्रार्द्धात् for चक्रार्धात् in II. 11, प्राक्यश्वा छोधितास्र, for प्राक् पश्चाच्छोधितास्तु, कायच्छेदः for कार्यश्छेदः, शून्यां वराष्ट for शून्याम्बराष्ट in II. 12, लध्वं for लब्धं, वासिष्ट for वासिष्ठ in II. 13, have been corrected by T and S, which I have also adopted.

The place of the Vāsiṣṭha in the history of Hindu Astronomy

The Vāsiṣṭha marks a stage of development in Hindu Astronomy, which is intermediate between those represented by the Paitāmaha (*P*) and the Saura Siddhāntas condensed by Varāha. The system we find in the *P* is the same as that we find in the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa (*V. J.*). The five-year-yuga, the beginning of the yuga from Māgha Śukla, the treatment of the Sun and the moon alone, the absence of the equation of the centre, so that all recockning is done using only the mean sun and the mean moon, the maximum and

minimum duration of daylight and its uniform increase and decrease, are all found in both. Only the methods are different, the *V. J.* giving the ending moments of Tithis, lunar and solar Nakṣatras etc., by an ingenious method which avoids computation using large numbers, while the *P* gives the Ahargaṇa first and uses this for computation, like the other Siddhāntas. The Saura, on the other-hand, represents the fully developed stage of Hindu Astronomy, extending the field of operations to the planets as well, using epicycles for the equation of the centre and the equation of conjunction, and using spherical trigonometry to solve various problems. In between comes the Vāsiṣṭha. Methods for the true sun and moon are given. Though the maximum and minimum daylight and its uniform increase and decrease is the same as in *P*, the Vāsiṣṭha deals with other topics also like computing the noon-shadow from the sun and *vice versa*, and the Lagna from the Sun and *vice versa*.

The Vāsiṣṭha gives a solar year of 365¼ days, which is fairly correct. As for the true sun, the method is crude, and is valuable only as indicating a distinction made between mean and true astronomical quantities, and the ability to express the same. Periods of 31¼, 31½, 31½, 31½, 31, 30½, 29¾, 29¼, 29¼, 29½, 30, 30¼, days are given for the sun to traverse the Rāśis, Meṣa etc., from which we can roughly say that the slowest motion is in the middle of Mithuna, and the quickest in the middle of Dhanus. All these are fairly accurate for the time of the Siddhānta.[1] Only, the days for Meṣa should be 31 and for Mīna 30½. Even here the error is less than ⅛ day, though it appears to be ¼ day.

The Vāsiṣṭha must have obtained these values empirically, most probably by an analysis of eclipses. It cannot be that it is Varāha that gives the values in this empirical form, computing them from the equation of the centre given by the original Vāsiṣṭha, for Varāha faithfully gives not merely the values, but also the method of the original. Or else

1. The periods of days agree well with the equation of the centre for the sun, about 132′ given by Hindu Astronomy. At about 200 A.D. the equation of the centre was nearly 120′, but with this was combined the moon's Annual Equation, about 12′, with the opposite sign, and this made the equation of the centre 132′.

why should he give different methods for the different Siddhāntas? In the case of the Vāsiṣṭha he gives the sun in periods of days, correct to quarter days. In the case of the Pauliśa he gives a correction in minutes to the mean sun, the correction depending upon Rāśis of "Anomaly," the term anomaly here being used in a peculiar sense. In the case of the Romaka he gives the correction to the Sun in the proper form of the equation of the centre, "*k* sine anomaly." In the case of the Saura he gives the regular epicyclic theory. It is also reasonable to suppose that before the epicyclic theory was formed, the previous three stages, just mentioned were gone through in the development of Hindu Astronomy.

As regards the moon, we have seen that the mean motion of the moon according to Vāsiṣṭha is more accurate than that of other Siddhāntas, as also its maximum equation of the centre, and its maximum-minimum daily true motion. This accuracy is possible only if observations of the moon with reference to the stars are made, instead of merely depending on analysis of eclipses, which is also necessary. Analysis of eclipses can give the mean motion correctly, but the maximum or minimum equation of the centre got would be only about $\pm 301'$, considerably less than the true values $\pm 377'$, because at syzygies where alone eclipses occur, the second inequality called the evection is reduced to the same form as the equation of the centre with the opposite sign, and a maximum numerical value $76'$, and thus reduces $377'$ to $301'$. It should not be argued that such accuracy is against Varāha's statement in I. 4. There he compares only the Tithis of different Siddhāntas (because that is the most essential thing required and one of the few things that are comparable), and Vāsiṣṭha-Tithi is spoiled not by the moon but by the sun got through using the incorrect mean solar year of 365¼ days,[1] and also by the roughness of the rules in II. 6 giving the moon's equation of the centre. As already explained (vide above) these rules must have been based on observation of the daily motions, and the theory that they increase or decrease uniformly. Thus the equation of the centre was expressed

1. *T* and *S* have emended Tithi into Kṛta, when both Mss. give Tithi, and condemned Vāsiṣṭha beyond Varāha's intention.

first in an algebraic form as in the Vāsiṣṭha. Then the trigonometrical expression, "*k* sine anomaly," was discovered and used, as agreeing better with observation. After this the epicycle theory was propounded, for everywhere in science theory comes later to explain observed facts. Thus the Vāsiṣṭha is historically important as marking a stage of the development of Hindu Astronomy, where we see the first dawn of the true motion of heavenly bodies.

THREE KANNAḌA INSCRIPTIONS OF THE TIME OF THE WESTERN CHĀḶUKYA VIKRAMĀDITYA VI

BY

Dr. N. Venkataramanayya

The three Kannaḍa inscriptions forming the subject matter of the present paper are taken from the unpublished volume of Telingāṇa Inscriptions revised by the late Rao Bahadur Sri C. R. Krishnamacharlu, Epigraphist to the Government of India. Of these the epigraph at Būrugagaḍḍa (A) in the Mahboobnagar District (Tel. Ins. Ch. 38) is perhaps the earliest. As the lower part of the stone on which the inscription is engraved is lost, it is not possible to ascertain the date when it was set up. Next in point of time comes the inscriptions at Gūḍūr in the Warangal District (*Ibid*. Ch. 35) (B), and at Kolanupāka (*Ibid*. Ch. 36) in the Nalgonda District (C) dated respectively C. V. 49 and 50. The characters are Telugu-Kannaḍa of the type commonly used in the inscriptions in Telingāṇa in the earlier half of the 12th century A.D.; and the language, though interspersed occasionally with a few stanzas in Sanskrit is Kannaḍa both prose and verse. Two features of the orthography deserve special mention. *Anusvāra* is frequently used in the place of nasal of the class belonging to the group of the consonants with which it is combined; and distinct preference is shown to the use of cerebrals *ṇa* and *ḷa* in the place of *na* and *la*. The consonant following the *rēpha* is frequently doubled. Scribal errors are numerous, and no attempt is made to correct them here, as they are too obvious to need special notice.

The Būrugagaḍḍa inscription (A) furnishes the following pedigrees of Anantapāla, the famous Brāhmaṇa general in the service of king Tribhuvanamalla Vikramāditya VI, and of his two nephews (sister's sons), Lakshmaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka, and Gōvinda Daṇḍanāyaka.

X

Padmanābha | Gaṇeśa Chamūpa of Dorakollaḍa in Madhyadēśa | Bhīma Daṇḍanātha

Mahēśvara Daṇḍanātha

Krishṇa Chamūpa *m.* Padmaladēvī | Anantapāla Daṇḍādhīśa

Lakshmaṇa Daṇḍādhīśa | Gōvindarasa Daṇḍanāyaka.

Historical information :—

Of these, Mahēśvara Daṇḍanātha, the father of Padmala and Anantapāla, is said to have been the principal pillar supporting the Chāḷukya family, and his son-in-law Kṛishṇa Chamūpa an ornament of the Kuntala country. Anantapāla is said to have acquired the title of *Chōḷa-kaṭaka-chūṟekāṟa*, after inflicting a defeat on the Chōḷa army, and plundering them during the course of pursuit as far as the city of Kāñchi. Gōvindarasa, the younger of the two sons of Kṛishṇa Chamūpa and Padmaladēvī and the nephew of Anantapāla, is said to have defeated a certain Kumāra in the battle of Jananātharājapura, and brought to his master all his (Kumāra's) property which he captured after the battle, and handed over to him Dūbe* and Goṁka whom he had taken prisoners.

In the Gūḍūr record (B) dated C. V. 49 Krōdhi, Pushya ba, 1 Wednesday, (23rd December, A.D. 1124), it is stated that Sāvi Daṇḍapa, also referred to varioulv as Sāvi Daṇḍādhipa, Sāvidēva, Sāvipayya, and Sāṁyidēva, an officer in the service of Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Chaḷukya Gaṁga Permāḍi Kumāra Sōmēśvaradēva, son of Tribhuvanamalladēva, made a gift to the temple of Mallēśvaradēva of Gumuḍūr of the village of Bammarige included in Koḷḷipāke-Seven Thousand, which he was governing on behalf of his master. Kumāra Sōmēśvara defeated in a battle the Chōḷaga and his younger brother (*Chōḷagaṁ tad=anuj=ādhīśaṁ*), and put them to flight; and like God Śiva, who burnt the three (Asura) cites, reduced to ashes the three Kaḷingas. This is supplemented by the information of the Kolanupāka inscription (C) of Kumāra Sōmēśvara's house-

* In some inscriptions the name is spelt as 'Dōche.'

hold minister, Svāmi Daṇḍanāyaka, dated C.V. 50, Viśvāvasu, Chaitra. ba. 3. Monday (24th March, A.D. 1125), in which it is stated that the emperor's son, king Sōmēśvara, chased the king of the Trikaḷinga country from the battle-field, plundered his territory and captured his elephants, To commemorate the prowess and victory of his master, Svāmi Daṇḍanāyaka set up a pillar of glory (*kīrtti-staṁbha*) in the temple of Aṁbaratilaka Kadaṁbikādēvī, known also as *Chāḷukya-kula-tilaka*, at Koḷḷipāke, the headquarters of the Seven Thousand district of that name, over which Kumāra Sōmēśvara was ruling. At the request of his minister, Somēśvara made a *sarva-namasya* gift of the village of Pānupuṟāyi excluding the *dēva-bhōga-svāmya* enjoyed by the Akka-basadi of the place, having freed it from all the *bādhas* or impediments, and entrusted the execution of this work of charity to Kēśirāja, the minister (*perggaḍe*) of the Goddess. It is interesting to note that at the time of the grant, Tribhuvanamalladēva (Vikramāditya VI) was still ruling the earth amusing himself in comfort, listening to the narration of good stories. He, however, appears to have nominated Kumāra Sōmēśvara as his successor, invested him with the insignia of royalty and entrusted to him the administration of the empire; for, it is stated that Chāḷukya Gaṁga Kumāra Sōmēśvaradēva assumed the office of kingship (ll 97-98 *vasudh=ādhipatya-padavīm=āruhyamāṇaś=chiram*). Svāmi Daṇḍanāyaka was an enlightened officer; for, he is said to have extended his patronage to all the creeds (*samaya*), Śaivism, Vaishṇavism, Buddhism and Jainism.

The victories on the battle-field and the military conquest of territory described in these three inscriptions took place during the Western Chāḷukya invasion of the Coastal Andhra country in A.D. 1118-19. The Coastal Andhra and Kalinga were then included in the dominions of the Chōla-Chāḷukya emperor Kulōttunga I; and the Western Chāḷukya Tribhuvanamalla-Vikramāditya VI, in pursuance of the traditional policy of his family, made, during his long reign of fifty years, several attempts to reduce them to subjection. As soon as he established himself on the throne, he appears to have despatched an expedition against Vēṅgī; for, it is stated in a copper-plate grant dated A.D. 1078 that Mummaḍi Bhīma, an officer in the service of Rājarāja II, the Chāḷukya-Chōḷa viceroy of Vēṅgī, assisted his master in his wars with the Ganga, Kaḷinga and

Kuntala kings. The Ganga king referred to in the inscription was obviously a scion of the Eastern Ganga family; and though the family affiliations of the Kaḷinga monarch cannot be traced at present, he must have been like his Ganga contemporary, an enemy of the Chōḷas who was desirous of throwing off the Chōḷa yoke and asserting his independence. They naturally sought the help of the king of Kuntala, *i.e.*, Vikramāditya VI, the enemy of the Chōḷa emperor. Rājarāja II could not cope with the invaders; that was apparently the reason why he preferred to live under the same roof as his parents to the viceroyalty of Vēṅgī and returned home, having relinquished his office.[1] Vīrachōla, his younger brother, who succeeded him as the viceroy in A.D. 1078-9, had no better luck. The Western Chāḷukya forces appear to have been more than a match for him; he was defeated in battle, and had to surrender the territory under his rule to the enemy; for Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Rājādityarasa, who was governing Kosavaḷam-Savalakkha country and Chabbi-jōyi Twenty-One Thousand under Vikramāditya VI in A.D. 1083 claims to have won victories over the Chōḷa armies. Some of the *birudas* which he presumably adopted after his victories are significant. The following *Toṇḍamaṇḍalika-maṇḍala-khāṇḍava-Pāṇḍunandana, Chōḷa-kīrtti-vallī-pallava-nidāha - samaya - divasakara, Chōḷa-kaṭaka - sūṟekāṟa,* and *Kānchīpura prabala-bala-pannaga-Vainatēya* deserve notice in this connection. They seem to indicate an attack of the Western Chālukya army on Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and Kāñchī which was probably intended to intercept Chōḷa reinforcements from reaching Vēṅgī.[2] More important than this is the undated Jinadi inscription of the Paramara prince Jagaddēva, one of the feudatories of Vikramāditya VI, according to which the Andhra king unable to oppose him took to flight, abandoning the inmates of his harem to their fate.[3] The existence of three Western Chālukya records dated respectively in C.V. 2 (A.D. 1078), C.V. 5 (A.D. 1081), and C.V. 6 (1082 A.D.), at Nadendla (in Guntur District) and at Dākshārāmam (in the E. Godavari District) substantiates the truth of the above statements.[4] It was probably Vīrachōḷa's failure to expel

---

1. ARE. 1922. Part II para. 6.
2. Tel. Ins. Ch. 19.
3. EI. XXII. pp. 54-63.
4. SII. IV Nos. 811 1317, 1161.

the invaders from Vēṅgī that led to his recall and the appointment of his brother Chōḍaganga as the viceroy in his place in A.D. 1084. Though nothing is known about what happened in Vēṅgī subsequent to Chōḍaganga's appointment as the viceroy, the absence of the Western Chālukya records in the east coast during the next thirty-six years indicates clearly that he was successful in driving them out of the country and restoring the authority of his family.

Vikramāditya VI seems to have made another attempt to conquer the Coastal Andhra country about A.D. 1113. In an inscription dated C.V. 37, Vijaya, Śrāvaṇa śu. 13, Ādivāra (Sunday, 12th July A.D. 1113) at Āvancha in the Kaluvakurti taluk of the Mahboobnagar District, Mahamaṇḍalēśvara Kumāra Tilapadēva, son of Vikramāditya VI, is stated to have been the wildfire to the forest, viz., the family of the king of Bengi (*Bengīśa-vaṁśa-vana-dāva-dahana*)[5]. As this *biruda* is not associated with the name of the prince in a record dated three years earlier, C.V. 35 (29th Oct. A.D. 1110)[6], it is not unreasonable to presume that the event which served as the basis for the assumption of the title must have taken place between A.D. 1110 and 1113. The victory claimed by Kumāra Tailapa over the king of Vēṅgī in the Āvancha epigraph cited above does not appear to have been fruitful, as no trace of the Western Chālukya power was found anywhere in the Coastal Andhra country. Prince Parāntaka, one of the sons of Kulōttunga I, who was governing Vēṅgī as his father's viceroy probably stemmed the tide of invasion and repulsed the Western Chālukya army. It was perhaps on this occasion that Parāntaka Magadharāya, who claims to have been the *dig=jaitra-yātrā sakhaḥ* of Parāntaka, assisted him in defeating the enemy.[7] However that may be, the next invasion which came in A.D. 1118 was more serious in its consequences. A series of disasters overtook the Chōḷa armies, and Kulōttunga I had to surrender the entire east coast from Trikaḷinga to Kāñchi in the closing years of his reign. The unsettled state of the Chōḷa empire, owing to the rivalry between Kulōttunga I's sons for the possession of their father's throne, must have contributed to the success of the Chāḷukyan arms. Kulōttunga I

5. Tel. Insc. Revised (Unpublished) No. 45.
6. *Ibid.* No. 44 (Āḷāvānipalle).
7. SII. IV. 1017.

seems to have recognized Parāntaka as heir-apparent and co-regent, in A.D. 1110 and sent him to govern Vēṅgī as his viceroy[7-a] but for some reasons unknown at present, he changed his mind in the last years of his reign, and nominated Vikrama Chōḷa as his successor in A.D. 1115.[8] This naturally led to the outbreak of dissensions in the Chōḷa empire, and Vikramāditya VI, who was ever on the look out for an opportunity to seize the Coastal Andhra country, sent his armies against it to accomplish his purpose.

The Western Chāḷukya invasion appears to have begun in A.D. 1118 or a little earlier, for by the middle of that year Kumāra Sōmēśvara very probably occupied the Three Kalingas, that is, the country extending from the Gōdāvarī to the Mahēndragiri in the Ganjam District of Orissa; and Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka, the commander-in-chief of the Western Chāḷukya expeditionary forces, was actively engaged in the subjugation of Vēṅgī.[9] The reduction of the Three Kaḷingas could not have been easily effected. The details of the warfare

---

7-*a*. See Appendix, Parāntaka, the forgotten Chāḷukya-Chōḷa Viceroy of Vēṅgī.

8. A.R. 163 of 1897, SII. VI. 123 equates Ś. 1054 with Vikrama Chōḷa's 17th regnal year, which indicates that Ś. 1037 (A.D. 1115) was as the year in which he was nominated by Kulōttunga I as his successor. *Per contra*, See, EI. VII. pp. 4-5, K.A.N. Sastri, Colas, II. P. 61.

9. An interesting epigraph at Dāksharāmam (SII. IV. 1322) which registers a gift of a lamp made, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse, to the temple of Bhīmēśvara by Chintalūri Bhīmarasa, a *preggaḍa* of Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka, clearly indicates that the Western Chāḷukya invasion was already in progress. This record curiously enough is dated in the 48th year and 411th day of the reign of Kulōttunga Chōḷa I (Wed. 22nd May. A.D. 1118 or Friday, 15th November, A.D. 1118, when the Moon suffered an eclipse). This apparent anomaly must be attributed to the uncertain state of affairs prevailing at the time. Although the Western Chāḷukyas gained a firm footing in Vēṅgī, the Chōḷa authority was not completely overthrown. The people especially the *sthānikas* of the temple of Dāksharāmam who still continued to regard the Chōḷa emperor as the lawful sovereign of the country, following the long established practice, quoted his regnal year, while registering the gift, though it was made by an officer in the service of the enemy.

are not recorded. The Gūḍūru (B) and the Kolanupāka (C) epigraphs, no doubt, allude to the victories of Kumāra Sōmēśvara in Trikaḷinga. In the former it is stated that he defeated Chōḷaga and his younger brother in battle and reduced the Three Kaḷingas to ashes; and the latter refers to his victory over the king of Trikaḷinga (*Trikaḷing=āvani-nṛipāla*) and the capture of his elephants. It is evident that Chōḷaga, his younger brother and the king of Trikaḷinga were all opposed to Sōmēśvara and that they were engaged jointly or severally in resisting his advance. Though their identity is not disclosed in the records mentioned above, there is little doubt that Chōḷaga was identical with Parāntaka and the king of Trikaḷinga with Anantavarman Chōḍaganga, the son of Kulōttunga's daughter Rājasundarī and the Eastern Ganga king, Rājarāja Dēvēndravarman, who is spoken of as *Trikaḷing=ādhīśvara* in a record at Dākshārāmam, dated A.D. 1108.[10] Who the younger brother of Chōḷaga that shared his defeat was cannot be ascertained in the present state of knowledge. Sōmēśvara's victory over them was complete; for a large part, if not the whole, of the Trikaḷinga country passed, as a consequence, into the hands of the Western Chāḷukya emperor and remained in his possession until at least A.D 1131. From an inscription at Appikoṇḍa in the Visakhapatnam taluk of that district dated Ś. 1053/C.V. 55, Sādhāraṇa, Phālguṇa, ba. 11, Wednesday (25th February A.D. 1131) we learn that Daṇḍanāyakas Māchimayya and Mārttaṇḍayya, the subordinates of Mahāpradhāna Daṇḍanāyaka Annarāja, were governing Viśākhapaṭṭaṇa in the east of Pampavāḍi.[11] The district of Pampavāḍi in which Viśākhapaṭṭaṇa was situated obviously derived its name from Paṁpā, a small stream in the East Godavari district;[12] it follows from this that the tract of territory extending from the Godavari to Viśākhapaṭṭanam in the east still remained under the Western Chālukyas at the time.

The failure of Parāntaka to withstand successfully the Western Chāḷukya invasion of Trikaḷinga was due to Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka's attack on Vēṅgī about the same time. The

10. A.R. 433 of 1893, SII. IV. 1363.
11. A.R.S. 2 of 1941-42.
12. A.R.E. 1913 Part II. Para. 70.

invaders appear to have met with sterner resistence in Vēṅgī than in Trikaḷinga. No less than three battles are said to have been fought in the country before the Western Chāḷukya commander could claim final victory. Besides the battle of Jananātharājapuram mentioned in the Būrugagaḍḍa record (A), two more engagements at Uppinakaṭṭe and Bengi are referred to in other inscriptions [12-a] The situation of Uppinakaṭṭe is not definitely known. Probably it is identical with one of the villages beginning with the prefix 'Uppa' in the East Godavari district. Of these three battles the one that was fought at Jananātharājapuram (Dākshārāmam) appears to have been the most important. Gōvindarasa, the nephew of Anantapāla, led the Chāḷukyan forces. Kumāra, that is, Parāntaka assisted by powerful feudatories like Dūbe and the Velnāḍu chief, Gonka I, took the field against him. In the fierce engagement that followed Parāntaka sustained defeat and took to flight; both Dūbe and Gonka I were taken prisoners; and Jananātharājapuram, the headquarters of the viceroyalty, fell into the hands of the enemy; Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka established himself in the city and concerted measures for the government of the conquered territory. Parāntaka did not however give up fight. Loyal supporters rallied round his standard and helped him to offer bitter resistence to the enemy.[12-b] He made a stand at Vēṅgī, and attempted to check the advance of the enemy; but the Western Chāḷukyan army again proved irresistible. He was, therefore, obliged to abandon the fort and retreat southwards, hotly pursued by the victorious Chāḷukyas, who plundered his

---

12-*a*. SII. VI. 111; IX. Part i. 220.
Bemgiyan=Uppinakaṭṭeyaṁ bisuṭṭ = ōḍida nambi Kaṁchavaragam biṟutōḍi negarttegeṭṭa dōr=madav=aḷid=irda Chōḷikere pēḷare sāhasaṃgaḷa.

12-*b*. A series of undated epigraphs at Dākshārāmam which obviously belong to this period records the vows taken by certain chiefs to serve none else except Parāntaka. The names of these are:

SII.	IV.	1269	Oḍḍavāḍi Chōḍayya
,,	,,	1270	Śrī Parāntaka Chōḍayya of Vīraghaṭṭa
,,	,,	1271	Sūraya of Bīraghoṭṭa
,,	,,	1272	Bhīmana of Jantur-nāḍu
,,	,,	1273	Bētayya of Ṟāpaṟṟu
,,	,,	1274	Vīrachōḍa of Saruda-nāḍu
,,	,,	1275-a	Rajādhirāja.

camp whenever circumstances were favourable. Parāntaka reached Kāñchi at last, but failed to find security even within its fortified walls; for, Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka who followed hard on his heels, inflicted a defeat on him and sacked the city. The establishment of the power of the Telugu Chōḷa chiefs of Nellore at Kāñchi was perhaps a direct consequence of this victory. The collapse of Parāntaka was in the main due to political changes in the Chōḷa capital, which affected him adversely. The old emperor Kulōttuṅga I lay dying in his bed; and Vikrama Chōḷa who was near his father in the capital seized all the power in the state and withheld help to Parāntaka so that the latter was thrown on his own resources, and left to face the enemy unaided. Moreover, some of his followers on whose loyalty and support he counted deserted him and joined the enemy.[13] Despite his defeat and the total loss of his territories, Parāntaka seems to have exercised for a short time some sort of authority over certain parts of the Tamil country. Three epigraphs of his reign, all dated in his 9th regnal year, are found at Tiruvālangāḍu in the Chittoor, Tiruvāḍutturai in the South Arcot, and Kovil-Tēvarāyanpēṭṭai in the Tanjore

---

13. Of his feudatories who went over to the enemy three deserve particular mention here: (1) The Velnāḍu chief, Gonka I who fell into the hands of the Western Chāḷukyas in the battle of Jananātharājapuram appears to have changed, to gain perhaps his freedom, his masters and acknowledged Vikramāditya VI as his soveriegn and overlord in or before A.D. 1120; for, in an inscription dated in that year, his son Rājendra Chōḷa acknowledges the supremacy of the Western Chāḷukya monarch (SII. IV. 1228); (2) Nūṁkaya, the son of Maḍapalli Piṭṭama, who, on account of his valuable services, was made Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Parāntaka Magadharāya by Parāntaka figures in an inscription of A.D. 1115-16 as his devoted servant. He is said to have assisted Parāntaka in the conquest of countries (*dig=jaitra-yātrā-sakhaḥ*) (SII. IV. 1017); but he joined the Western Chāḷukyas and refers to Vikrāmaditya VI in a record of A.D. 1122 as his overlord. (SII. IV. 1250). (3) The Pallava chief, Māndalika Bodda and his younger brother Bhīma obtained from Parāntaka in A.D. 1116 the *raḍḍikam* of Bezwada; but like the other chiefs mentioned above he also transferred his allegiance to Vīkramāditya VI before A.D. 1122 and secured from him the confirmation of his office as the *raḍḍi* of Bezwada. (SII. IV. 737, VI. 91, 100).

districts.[14] From this it is evident that Parāntaka was able to impose his rule over parts Toṇḍai and Chōḷa maṇḍalams. How he managed to accomplish this is not clear. His rule in the Tamil country, however, appears to have been very short; for no trace of his power is found anywhere subsequent to his 9th year.

The Western Chāḷukyas held sway over the Coastal Andhra country for more than a decade and a half. Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka was appointed by Vikramāditya VI as the governor of the conquered territory. He was assisted by his two nephews, Lakshmaṇa and Gōvinda, besides a host of civil and military officers in upholding his authority. The existing administrative arrangements were not tampered with. Although the old feudatory families were generally allowed, on accepting of course the Western Chāḷukya supremacy, to rule as formerly their hereditary estates, a few noble families from the Western Chāḷukya dominions were permitted to migrate and establish themselves in the conquered territory. The Telugu Chōḷas of Koṇidena or Koṭyadona and of Nellore deserve particular mention in this connection. The former came from Koṭyadona in the Bellary District, and the latter from the Raichur and Gulbarga Districts of the erstwhile Hyderabad State, and settled down at Koṇidena (Koṭyadona) Guntur District and Nellore respectively. Nevertheless, the Andhras of the coastal districts did not submit to the Western Chāḷukyas tamely. There is reason to believe that Malayamaṇḍala, corresponding to the present Godavari Agency was the first to throw off the Western Chāḷukyan yoke. A certain Sūraparāja of the Eastern Chāḷukyan lineage appears to have asserted his independence in Ś. 1048 (A.D. 1126-7), assumed the Eastern Chāḷukyan royal titles *Sarvalōkāśraya* and *Vishṇuvardhana,* and set up the standard of rebellion. In an inscription at Dākshārāmam dated Ś. 1051 corresponding to his 4th regnal year, it is stated that Malaya-mārttaṇḍa *i.e.,* Sūraparāja rose in the Malay=*Ōdaya* (the sunrise mountain of Malaya), scattered the darkness, *viz.* the enemy kings, and was ruling the country by the power of his sword. He is also spoken of as the

14. A.R. 16 of 1896, 261 of 1923, 225 of 1928-29. I am obliged to Sri T. N. Subramanian for drawing my attention to these records.

uplifter of the (Eastern) Chāḷukyas in the Malaya-maṇḍala of Vēṅgi-nāḍu.[15] He was considerably helped by his minister Nūṁkana Preggaḍa and the Pallava chief, Bhīmi Nāyaka, the younger brother of Māṇḍalika Boddi Nāyaka, who appears to have joined him;[16] and Anantavarman Chōḍaganga, the king of Kaḷiṅga, seems to have lent him his support.[17] At the same time Vikrama Chōḷa made an attempt to drive away the Western Chāḷukyas from the Coastal Andhra and re-establish there the authority of his family. A certain

---

15. SII. IV. 1177, A.R. 303 of 1893.

Abhyudyan=Malay=Ōdayād=ari-nṛipa-dhvāntaṁ sam=uchchhāṭayan
Padm=ābhyunnatim=unnayan prati-dinaṁ dōr=maṇḍalāgra-śriyā
sad=vargam paripālayan=vasu-śatair= āśās=sadā pūrayan
śūrō vaṁśakaraḥ kshitau Malaya-mārttaṇḍaś=chiraṁ rājatē ||
Veṁgi-nānṭi Malaya-maṇḍalamuna Chāḷukya-sam=uddharaṇuṇḍ=aina Sūraparāju.

16. SII. IV. 1193, A.R. 314 of 1893, SII. IV. 1170, A.R. 299 of 1893.

17. No less than five queens of Anantavarman, and one of his mothers-in-law, acknowledge this Sarvalōkaśraya Vishṇuvardhana as the reigning sovereign and quote his regnal years in their inscriptions registering gifts to the temple of Bhīmēśvara at Dākshārāmam.

SII.	IV.	1191	Śaka	1050	Regnal	year	2nd	Rājaladēvī
,,	,,	1192	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	Padmaladēvī
,,	,,	1195	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	Śriyyādēvī
,,	,,	1196	,,	,,	,,	,,	3rd	Līlāvātī
,,	,,	1197	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	Lakshmīdēvī, mother of Līlāvatī
,,	,,	1198	,,	,,	,,	,,	,,	Kalyāṇadēvī.

To these, the name of Jayaṁgoṇḍa Chōḍiyam *alias* Kaḷiṅgadēvī (SII. IV. 1194), another queen ot Anantavarman, may be added; for though there is no mention of Sarvalōkāśraya Vishṇuvardhana or his regnal year in her record, it is dated like others in Śaka 1050, and registers like them the gift of perpetual lamp to the temple of Bhīmēśvara at Dākshāramam. However that may be, these inscriptions clearly indicate that there existed at that time a strong bond of friendship between this Sarvalōkāśraya Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja and Anantavarman Chōḍaganga.

Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Nombaya with the titles, lord of the city of Koḷḷipāka and the Shaṭsahasra country (Velanāḍu) acknowledges the supremacy of Vikrama Chōḷa in an inscription at Chēbrōḷu in the Guntur District, dated in the 9th regnal year of the king, corresponding to Ś. 1049 (A.D. 1127)[18] As Anantapāla Daṇḍanāyaka was ruling this part of the country in the previous year,[19] it looks as if the Western Chāḷukyas were dislodged from this region immediately after the death of Vikramāditya VI. An inscription dated in Vikrama Chōḷa's 17th regnal year corresponding to Ś. 1054 (A.D. 1132-3) at Niḍubrōlu in the Guntur District describes, as a matter of fact, in magniloquent language the victory of Daṇḍanāyaka Paṇḍa, the maternal uncle of the Velanāḍu chief, Gonka II, over the Karṇāṭa, Marāṭa and Lāṭa armies.[20] It is obvious from these that Vikrama Chōḷa succeeded in reconquering from the Western Chāḷukyas a large part, if not the whole, of the Velanāḍu country before the end of his reign. His death in A.D. 1133 and accession to the throne of his grandson Kulōttuṅga II, whom he adopted as his son, seems to have retarded the progress of the reconquest. Although inscriptions of Kulōttuṅga II dated in his 2nd, 3rd, and 4th regnal years are found at Bapatla and other places in the Velanāḍu country, no trace of his rule has been discovered so far anywhere to the north of it until his 7th year (A.D. 1139)[21]. What happened in the interval, it is not possible to state in the present state of knowledge. There was perhaps a general revolt in the Coastal Andhra against the Western Chāḷukya rule headed by the Velanāḍu chiefs. The belief current in certain quarters that the expulsion of the Western Chāḷukyas from the east coast was effected entirely by the unaided efforts of the Velanāḍu chiefs is quite unwarranted. True, the Velanāḍu chiefs take the entire credit for the achievement for themselves; but it must be borne in mind that it was customary in those days for the feudatories to claim for themselves victories in military enterprises undertaken by their soveriegns in which they

18. A.R. 153 of 1897, EI. VI. pp. 223-27.

19. SII. VI. 112, 113, IX. i. 212, 213.

20. SII. VI 123, 163 of 1897.

21. SII. VI. 170 (210 of 1897), SII. VI. 182 (182 of 1897), SII. VI. 143 (183 of 1897), 116 of 1917, SII. VI. 630 (185 of 1899), 574 of 1907, SII. IV. 1068 (227 of 1893).

participated. A survey of the inscriptions of the period clearly shows that the suzerainty of Kulōttuṅga II was generally acknowledged in the Coastal Andhra country. The feudatory chiefs who held sway over this region would not have accepted his supremacy, had there not been strong grounds compelling them to do so. The *Kulōttuṅgan Piḷḷat=Tamiḻ* of Ōṭṭakūttan, who flourished in the court of Kulōttuṅga II attributes to his patorn victories over the W, Chāḷukyas. In one of the stanzas of the poem, he is said to have destroyed Taila and his family.[22] This was obviously Kumāra Tailapadēvā, son of Vikramāditya VI, who was governing parts of Telingāṇa during the time of his father and his elder brother Sōmēśvara III.[23] It is not, therefore, unreasonable to suppose that Kulōttuṅga II continued the war for the reconquest of the Coastal Andhra country begun by his predecessor and carried it on to a successful termination. The final battle of the campaign was fought somewhere on the banks of the Gōdāvarī in which, thanks to the generalship of Māma Paṇḍa, the commander-in-chief of the Velanāḍu forces, the Western Chāḷukya army under Daṇḍānāyakas Lakshmaṇa and Gōvinda suffered a disastrous defeat and retired to their own country for good.[24]

---

22. *Kulōttunga Chōḻan Piḷḷai-tTamiḻ.*

23. See, Tel. Ins. Ch. Nos. 33, 40.

24. SII. IV. 1141, AR. 277 of 1893. It is generally believed that Daṇḍanāyakas Lakshmaṇa and Gōvinda defeated by Gonka in the battle of the Gōdāvarī were the nephews of Anantapāla, and the sons of Anantapāla's sister Padmaladēvī and her husband Kṛishṇarāja. It is however doubtful whether they were still in charge of Vēṅgī at the time of the battle of the Gōdāvarī, which must have taken place subsequent to A.D. 1135; for, there were two other Brahman generals of these same names ruling over Vēṅgī about the time of the battle. In an inscription at Dākshārāmam dated C. V. 58 corresponding to Ś. 1055 (A.D. 1133-4) (SII. IV. 1094, AR. 243-B of 1893) Lakshmādhipa or Lakshmaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka, son of Mākāmbā, is described as the king of Vēṅgī (*Vēṁgī-mahī-vallabhaḥ*); and with him is associated Govindarāja son of Bāgi Mādimayya Nāyaka of the *agrahāra* of Iṭṭage in the Beḷvoḷ-nāḍu who was probably his lieutenant. Very probably these were identical with the Western Chāḷukyan generals who suffered defeat in the battle of the Gōdāvarī.

A

Burugagaḍḍa Inscription.

1. Namas = tunga-śiraś = chumbi chaṁdra-chāmara-chāravē trailō-
2. kya-nagar = āraṁbha-mūḷa-staṁbhāya Śaṁbhavē || [1*] Svasti sa-
3. masta-bhuvan = āśraya Śrī-Prithvī[1]-vallabha mahā-rā-
4. j = ādhirājaṁ Paramēśvaraṁ Parama-bhaṭṭārakaṁ Satyāśraya-
5. kuḷā-tiḷakaṁ Chāḷuky = ābharaṇaṁ Śrīmat = Tribhu-vanamalladēvara-
6. vijaya-rājyam = uttar = ōttar = ābhivriddhi[2]-pravard-dhamānam = āchaṁ-
7. [dr = ā]rkka-tār = aṁbaraṁ saluttum = ire tat = -pāda-padm = ōpajīvi sam = a-
8. dhigata-paṁcha-mahāśabda mahā-sāmant = ādhipati mahā-pracha-
9. ṇḍa-daṇḍanāyakaṁ vibudha-vara-dāyakaṁ sujana-prasannaṁ nuḍi-
10. [du] mattennaṁ gōtra-pavitraṁ par = āṁganā-put-raṁ [tureya-rēvanta]-
11. vairi-kritāṁta][3] sāhas = ōttuṁgan = ayyana-siṁga-nām = ādi sama-
12. sta-prasasti[4] sahitaṁ Srīmanu[4-a] mahā-pradhānaṁ bhāṇasa-verggaḍe = ma-
13. ne-verggaḍe Daṇḍanāyakan = Anantapālayyaṁgaḷu Bēṁgi pannir = chchhāsira-mu-
14. [man = Emmedale-yāṟu] sāsiramum = nāḷutt = arasu-geyyutt = iralu ||
15. Mahā-pradhānaṁ Daṇḍanāyaka-Gōvind = arasaru[||*] Ghana [śau
16. [ryyaṁ] Jananātha-rāja-purad = iṁdaṁ kādi taṁ-daṁ Kumārana-sarvvasva-

---

1. Read *prithvī*.
2. Read *ābhivṛiddhi*.
3. Read *kritāṁta*.
4. Read *praśasti*.
4-*a*. Read *Śrīman*,

17. man-aṭṭi-muṭṭi-piḍitaṁdaṁ Dūbeyaṁ Goṁkanaṁ munid=akshēpa-
18. de.........[*Chō]ḷ = ōrvviśana taṁda-novane-suṭṭaṁ sariyiṭṭ [Bēṁgipura]
19. maṁ [Gōvinda-] Daṇḍādhipa || Ant-enisida Daṇḍa-nāyakaṁ Gōvinda-
20. rasan=anvayam=entene|| Dharaṇī-kānteyamadhya-dēśam-enesird=ā-
21. madhya-dēśaṁ manōharam = ātm = ōrjjita-pūrvva-janma-sukri-[5]
22. ....marttyara-janmaṁ Perekoḷḷad=eṁba mahanīya-
23. sthāna-doḷu[5-a] puṭṭi bhāsura-tējaṁ negaḷdaṁ Gaṇēś-vara-chamūpaṁ vipra-
24. vaṁś=ōttama || Ā-ramaṇī-manō-ramaṇan =agrajan-ishṭa-viśishṭa-
25. lōka-nistārakan = anvay= āṁbara-sarat[6] = samay= ēṁdu-payōdhiy=ante gaṁ-
26. bhīran = udāra-chāru-charitaṁ guṇa-bhūśaṇan[7] = endu-baṇṇisalu dhāriṇi[8]
27. Padmanābha-nava-dāta-yaśaṁ negaḷdam dharitri-yoḷu[9] || Negardd=irdd=ā-Pa-
28. dmanābhaṁg=aṇugina-tanayaṁ vīra-vidvishṭa-sēnā-mriga[10]-yūdh=ābhīla-ka-
29. ṇṭhīravan=anupama-sauṁdaryyan= urvvī-taḷa-vyāp [t*]a-guṇam-kīrtti-pri-
30. yaṁ Kuṁtaḷa-viśaya[11]-vadhū-maṇḍanaṁ śāśvata-lakshmig=eḍarppādaṁ dha-
31. ritrī-nayana-kumudinī-chaṁdraṁ Krishṭa[12] rāja[||*] Puruśārtthakk[13]=

---

5. Read *sukṛi.*
5-*a.* Read *dōḷ.*
6. Read *śarat.*
7. Read *bhūshaṇan.*
8. Read *baṇṇisal dhāruṇi.*
9. Read *dharitriyol.*
10. Read *mṛiga.*
11. Read *vishaya.*
12. Read *Kṛishṇa.*
13. Read *Purushārtha.*

32. eḍe vikramakke-nele dharmmkkārmam=audāryyad =ādaramoḷpiṁ=geṟevanaṭṭu ni-

33. rmmaḷateg=āvāsaṁ nayakk=irkke sach=charitakk =āśrayam=eṁdu lōkam=anituṁ kayi-

34. vāraḍiṁ[13-a] baṇṇisutt=ire pēḻukrishṇa-chamupanoḷu[14] saman=enelu kāvaṁ dharā-chakradoḷu[14-a] ||

35. Avanipa-janakke vaṁśam=ananta-guṇ=ōtkaradin= eneye jananī-kuḷavaṁśa-[vi]-

36. śrānta-parilagna kīrttiy=adent=ene vimaḷ=ānva- vāya-dhāmaṁ Bhīmaṁ || Dvija-vaṁś=āṁ-

37. bhōda-mārgga - dyumaṇi sakaḷa - sāmanta-chakr || [ādhi]nāthaṁ vijaya-śrī[kāntā]-

38. kaukshēyaka.........ddaṇḍan=udvritta[15]-vairi-dhva- jinī-pradhvāṁta-vidhvaṁsana......

39. mārttaṇḍa neṁ dhṛitiyam viśva-janaṁ vyāvarṇnisutt =īrppenam=esed=[adaṭaṁ]

40. [Bhī]ma-daṇḍ=ādhināthaṁ || Śaraṇ=āyāta śaraṇ- yan=endu vibhav=aikāvāsam=endu pra-

41. rabhū...van = endu iḷā-vaḷeyam = ā-Bhīm=ātma- jātaṁge sādarad=iṁda[ṁ]posa-

42. ye pemp-aḍedaṁ chāturyya-kandaṁ Mahēśva[ra]- daṇḍādhipan=ī-Chaḷukya-kuḷa-mūḷa-[staṁ]-

43. bhanaṁ baṇṇisal || A......chakrige tanna.jaya-bhujā- vikrānta......

44. .....vairi-puraṁgaḷam..... [va]cha-śrīy=ananta[vī]- budh=āgraṇi lakshmi-[seṭṭi]-

45. yaṁ Mahēśvara-chamūpaṁ viśva-vidvajjana=pra- ṇutaṁ śādhita[16]-śatrumaṇḍaḷa-

46 n=arkka-śōbha.bhūmaṇḍanaṁ || Tat=tanayana-m= aśēsha-jagat=tiḷakaṁ [kīrtti]-

47. vallarī-vaḷayita-digubhitti[17] [śatru]-nripati[18]-[kula] -phaṇibhit=tārkshyan=Anantapāla-da

13-*a*. Read *kaivāradin.*

14. Read *pēḻ Kṛishṇa-chamūpanoḷ.*

14-*a*. Read *enel kāvaṁ dharā-chakradoḷ.*

15. Read *udvṛitta.*

16. Read *sādhita,*

17. Read *digbhitti.*

18. Read *nṛipati.*

48. ṇḍādhīśa || Odavida-manasirkke tale-dōṟada munna me...mūrtti-go-

49. ṇḍudu sirike.goṇḍudu manaṁ bage-goṇḍudu nanni [neṟe] goṁḍudu na-

50. yam=ōja(ṁ)-goṇḍudu[śiriyaṁ] nele-goṇḍudu rū-ḍhirūpu-goṇḍudu[nu]ḍi [rā-]śi-goṇḍu-

51. du negartteya tējav=Anantapāḷanā ||...

52. pan=anantav=āsthāndoḷ=[oppiraṁjisu]va tējam=anantav=adhīśan=endud=aṁta....

53. mārppadaṭ=enantam=iderchchida bhūmipāḷa-santānaman=okki-[ti]kkuva vinōdav=anant-[Avana]-

54. ntapāḷanā || Akapaṭadiṁde kaṁḍa para-bhūmipa [ro]ḷ=vesageyya-rāshṭra-kaṁṭaka-

55. [r=eni]p = ānya-maṁdaḷikar = āhavadolu[18-a] bīḻgu [tōḍe kādi] Chauḷika-paḍeyaṁ-paḍalva-

56. [ḍ]si Kaṁchi-varaṁ sale sūṟe-goṇḍu Chōḷa-kaṭaka-sūṟekāṟanoḷ=idirchchuvan=āvan=A-

57. nantapalanoḷu[18-b] || Ā-negard = Anantapāḷa-chamūnāthana bhagni Krishṇa[19]-rājana-shati[20] sindā...

58. kīrtti Padmaladēvi ... sutan = agraje Mahēśa-daṇḍ=ādhipanā || [Na]yan=ānaṁda ...

59. tanna ... gaḷ = daudāryyam = āścharryyaṁ bhūri-yaśaṁ lōkaman=ellamaṁ ba-

60. . . . .

61. Padmaladēvi bhū-bhuvanadoḷu[20-a] vikhyātiyaṁ tāḷdi-daḷu[20-b] || Enis=irdda Padmaladēvi[ge]

62. ......Krisṇa[21]-rājaṁgaṁ sajjana-vinutaṁ puṭṭidan =aty=an=upamita-lakshma

---

18-*a*. Read *āhavadoḷ*
18-*b*. Read *noḷ*.
19. Read *bhagini Kṛishṇa*.
20. Read *sati*.
20-*a*. Read *doḷ*.
20-*b*. *taḷdidaḷ*.
21. Read *Kṛishṇa*,

B

Gūḍūru Inscription.

FIRST SIDE

1. @ Svasti Samasta-bhuvan=āśraya
2. Śrī[1] Prithvī[2]-vallabha Mahārāj=ādhirā-
3. ja-Paramēśvaraṁ Parama-bhaṭṭārakaṁ
4. Satyaśra[ya]-kuḷa-tiḷakaṁ Chāluky=ā-
5. bharaṇaṁ Śrīma-Trabhuvanamalladēvara[3]
6. vijaya-rājyam = uttar=ōttar=ābhivṛiddhi-pravard-
   dhamā-
7. nam = āchaṁdr = ārkka-tāṟ-aṁbaraṁ saluttaṁ
   Jayntī-
8. purada nelvīḍinoḷu sukha-saṁkathā-vi-
9. nōdadim rājyaṁ geyuttam=ire || Tad=ātmajaṁ
10. @ Svasti sam=adhigata-paṁcha-mahā-śabda mahā-
11. maṇḍaḷēsvaraṁ[4] vīra-mahēśvaraṁ[5] vijaya-lakshmī-
    viniṿā-
12. -saṁ raksha-daksha-dakshiṇa-dōr = ddaṇḍaṁ dvā-
    daśa-maṇḍa-
13. ḷika [r=oḷu[5-a]] mārttaṇḍaṁ pratāp=ākrānta-nava-
    khaṁḍa-bhūmaṇḍaḷaṁ
14. rāja-līlā-chamatkṛit=ākhaṁḍaḷaṁ kōdaṁḍa-chatur-
    bbhu-
15. jaṁ śṛiṁgāra-makaradhvajaṁ tribhuvana-raṁga-
    prāvarttita-
16. kīrtti-narttakī-narttana-sūtradhāraṁ śaraṇ=āgata-
    vajra-
17. prākāra [ṁ] mūṟu-rāya-kali-kuvara-biruda-hṛi-
18. day = ākaṁpaṁ tyāga-jaga-jhaṁpan=artthi-jana-
    chintit=ārttha-chiṁ-
19. (chiṁ)tāmaṇi subhaṭa-maṁḍaḷika-makuṭa-chūḍā-
20. maṇi Kuntaḷa-rājy=ābhuday=ayka[6]-kāraṇaṁ bappa-
21. na-gaṁdha-vāraṇaṁ Śrīmach=Chāḷukya Gaṁga-
    Permmāḍi-

---

1. The form of Śrī is very much like @ in l. 1.
2. Read *Pṛithvī.*
3. The letter Śri is written like @. Read *Śrīmat=Tribhuvanamalladēvara.*
4. Read *maṇḍalēśvaram.*
5. Read *Vīra-māhēśvaram.*

5-*a*. Read *maṇḍalikar-oḷ.*

6. Read *aika.*

22. kumāraṁ Sōmēśvaradēvaṁ || Vṛittaṁ || Moḷav=etl-etti-
23. dat āḷa-bāḷa-jaḷadiṁ=[mey=goṇḍ=a] mitr=āṁgan =ā[6-a]
24. kuḷa-bāḻpa-dravadiṁ taḷi[r] thu ripu-sēnā-chakra
25. rakt = āṁ[budhi]ṁ baḷadat[6-b]=tiṁgaḷu pāhit-āhita-gaḷā-
26. t=Kāḷiṁga-mātaṁga-saṁkuḷa-dāna-plavadiṁ=parā-
27. krama-vanaṁ Sōmēśvar=ōrvviśanā || [1||] Prakaṭ=āṭōpada Chōḷagan=ta-
28. d=anuj=ādhiśaṁ tāra [ḷdō] ḍe[6-c] sainika-vīr=āmarakōṭi
29. kōṭi [vidha]daṁ koṁḍ=āḍi kōp=āgniyiṁda Kaḷiṁga-tra-
30. ya[maṁ] pura-tṛiteyamaṁ[7] suṭṭ-aṁte suṭṭ=iṭṭidaṁ Tri-
31. kaḷiṁga-tripura[=āri-sōman=e]nipaṁ Ṣomēśvar=ōrbbīśvaram || [2 || *]

SECOND SIDE.

32. [T] at=pāda-padm=ōpajivi sam=adhigata-
33. [paṁcha]-mahā-śabda mahā-sāmant=ādhi-
34. [pa]ti mahā-prachaṁḍa-daṁḍanāyaka[ṁ] || Vṛi ||
35. Madavad=vi[dvi]shṭa-sainya-prabaḷa-vipina-dā-
36. vānaḷam vāra-yōshid=vadan=āṁbhōjāta-rāg=ō-
37. daya-dinakaran=ātmīya-dān=āṁbu-dhārā-
38. mudit=āśēsh=ārtha[8]-kēki-vrajan=amaḷa-ya-
39. śō-mauktik=āḷaṁkṛit=āśā-radan = īṁdraṁ śishṭa-chiṁ-
40. tamaṇiy=ene negaḻdamy Svāmi-daṁḍ=ādhināthaṁ|| [3 ||*]
41. @ Atūḷa-bhujā-baḷaṁ ripu-bhayaṁkara-kāra-
42. ṇam=ātma-dānam=āśṛita[9]-jana-tūshṭi-kā-
43. raṇam=amēya-viśuddha-charitra-saṁ-
44. padaṁ kshiti-nuta-kāraṇaṁ nija-manōha-
45. ra-manmatha-mūrtti kāminī-brata-jita-kāra-
46. ṇaṁ [dale] nutirppudu dhāriṇi Sāvi dē-

6-*a*. Read *dad=aḷavāḷa-jaladim markoṇḍ=amitrāṁ ganā.*
6-*b*. Read *beledat.*
6-*c*. Read *teraḷd=ōḍe.*
7. Read *tritayamam.*
8. Read *arthi.*
9. Read *āṣrita.*

47. vanā || [|| 4 ||*] || Kaṁdaṁ || Bhīru-mahībhṛit=pra-
kṛr=ādhā-
48. ratey=iṁda[ṁna]-satvadiṁd=anupami-
49. t-ākāradin=enipu-vāridhi-vārīye
50. [tara]vāri Sāvi-daṁḍādhipanā || [5||*] Svasti
51. Śrīmach=Chāḷukya-Vikrama-śaka-varshada 49 ne-
52. ya Krōdhi saṁvatsarada Pushya bahu-
53. ḷā Budha-vāradaṁdu Śrīman=mahā-
54. maṁḍaḷ=ēśvaraṁ Chāḷukya-Gaṁga-Permmāḍi-ku-
55. māraṁ Somēśvaradēvaru || mahā-pra
56. dhānaṁ mane-perggaḍe Koḷḷipāke er=chchhāsi-
57. rada-daṁḍanāyakaṁ Sāvipayyaṁgaḷa binna-
58. padin=uttarāyaṇa-saṁkrāṁti nimittaṁ
59. Gumuḍūra Mallēśvara-dēvar=aṁga-bhō-
60. ga-raṁga-bhōgaṁgaḷe sarvva-bādhā-parihāraṁ
61. sarvva-namaśyav=āgi Vēlpugoṁḍe 24 ṟa
62. baḷiya Bammarigeya dhārā-pū
63. rvvakaṁ māḍidaru || Sva-dattaṁ para-dattaṁ
64. vā rājabhis=Sagar=ādibhiḥ yasya- [yasya*] ya-
65. dā bhūmis=tasya tasya ta-
66. dā phaḷam || Śrīmat-trēḷukya-[10] nāthaṁ di-
67. vija-danuja-nāgēṁdra-bhāsvat=kirīṭa-stō-
68. ma-byākīrṇa-nānā-maṇi-kiraṇa-sam=ā-
69. vēshṭya-pād=āraviṁdaṁ kāma-pra-dhvaṁsi Gāṁgā
70. jaḷa-vilasita-jūṭa-sthaḷaṁ chaṁdra-chu-
71. ḍ=ārāmaṁ Mallēśvaraṁ nimm=abhimata-pha-
72. ḷa-samsiddhīyaṁ māḷke nichchaṁ || ⊚⊚[11]

C

KOLANUPĀKA INSCRIPTION.

FIRST SIDE

1. Aṁbara-tiḷaka-sthānadoḷ=aṁbara-taḷa-tiḷa-
2. kam=esedud=urvvī-lalan=āḷaṁbana-
3. ratna-stambham=id=eṁb=inegaṁ Svāmi-
4. dēva-kīrtti-stambhaṁ || Svasti srī-
5. mach=Chāḷukya-Vikrama-varshada
6. ayvatteneya Viśvasu[12] saṁvatsara-
7. da Chaitra bahuḷa tadige
8. Sōma-vāradaṁdu uttarāyaṇa saṁ-

---

10. Read *trailōkya.*
11. These take the place of *Śrī Śrī.*
12. Read *Viśvāvasu.*

9. krāṁti nimittaṁ Śrīman=mahā-maṇḍaḷēśva-
10. raṁ Chāḷukya-Gaṁga-Permmāḍi ku-
11. māra Somēśvara-dēvar=mahā-
12. pradhānaṁ mane-verggaḍe Koḷḷipāke
13. yer=chchhāsirada-daṇḍanāyakaṁ Sāṁyi-
14. [ma]yyyagaḷa binnapadiṁ nija-rā-
15. jadhāni Koḷḷipākeya Chāḷukya-
16. kuḷa-tiḷakam=enisid=Aṁbara-tila-
17. kad=Aṁbikādēvig=aṁga-bhōga raṁga-bhō-
18. gaṁ-gaḷige Poḷala baḷiya Pānu-
19. puṟāy=eṁb=ūruṁ sarvva-namasyaṁ
20. sarvva-bādhā-parihāram=āge
21. dhārā-pūrvvakam māḍi koṭṭar ||
22. Dēviya-perggaḍey=āda Kēsirājan=ī-
23. dharmmaman=ūrjitam=āge naḍasuvaṁ ||
24. Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā rājabhis=Sagar=ā-
25. dibhir=yyasya yasya yadā bhūmis=tasya
26. tasya tadhā phaḷaṁ || Mad=vaṁśajāḥ para-ma-
27. hīpati-vaṁśajā vā pāpād=apēta-ma-
28. nasō bhuvi-bhāvi-bhūpāḥ yē pāla-
29. yaṁti mama-dharmmam=imaṁ samaṁstaṁ [13]
30. tēshām mayā virachit=ōṁjalir=esha-
31. mūrdhni[ḥ] [||*] idan=āchaṁdr=ārkk=āṁbara-
32. m=udit=ōditam=āge kādaṁ para-
33. ma=sukh=āspad=akkum pāpadin=aḷida
34. dur=ātmaṁ narakaṁ-gatike gaḷa-gaḷan=a-
35. ḷiguṁ || śrīmd=Akka-basadige pū-
36. rvvadalu naḍava dēva-bhōga svāmyava
37. poṟag=āgi biṭṭar || ◎ ◎ ◎ -
38. ★ (Sun) ◡ (Crescent Moon)

SECOND SIDE

39. Apratima-pratāpan=anavadya-guṇaṁ ni-
40. ja-dāna-tṛipta-dēva-prakaraṁ samasta-jaga-
41. tī-taḷa varttita-kīrtti Sāvidēva prabhu-
42. daṇḍanātha-tiḷakaṁ negaḷdam jagadoḷ
43. janānurāga-prabhavādhika-saṁpaday=e-
44. nirppa jan=ōkti sad=ukti yappinam || Pra-
45. bhu-śakti khyātiy=iṁdaṁ nija-pati-
46. g=atuḷ-aiśvaryyamaṁ maṁtra śakti-prabheyiṁ
47. tat=prājya-rājy=ābhyudaya-padaviyaṁ

13. Read *Samastam.*

48. svīkṛit=ōtsāha-śakti-prabhava-śrīyiṁ tad=u-
49. tsāham=adanopa vinidamḍe[13-a] sāmānya-
50. saṁpat=prabhu-maṁtr=ōtsāha-śakti tray-naya-
51. [niya] taṁ Svāmi-daṇḍ=ādhināthaṁ || Śaranidhi-
52. y=aṁt=aśēsha-mahim=āspadan=eṁbara[13-b]
53. [da]ṁte mitra-sadguru-kavirāja-vaibhava-karaṁ
54. raviy=aṁtesa dāna-bhōgan=aṁburuha-tanū-
55. jan=aṁte chaturānana=niṁdra nagēṁdrad=aṁte su-
56. s[th*]ira-taraṇ-iṁde baṇṇipudu Sāvi-chamū-
57. patiyaṁ jagaj=janam [1*] Hari-Hara-Ji-
58. na-Buddha-pad=āṁburuha namad=bhrma-
59. ran=oppidaṁ sakaḷa-vasuṁdharage cha-
60. tus-samaya-sam=uddharaṇam Śrī Svā-
61. midēva-daṇḍādhīśaṁ ||

Cow and Calf, ★ Sun, ◡ Crescent Moon
Running Boar, 卐, Daggar, Two lampstands.

62. Tṛi[14]-kaḷiṁg=āvani-pāḷanaṁ samaradoḷ beṁ-
63. koṇḍu tad=dēśamaṁ prakaṭ=āṭōpade sūṟe-
64. goṇḍu tad=udagr=ēbhaṁgaḷam mutti-koṇḍu-ku-
65. mār=āgraṇi geldu Chakri-tanayaṁ Sōmēśva-
66. r=ōrvvīśvaraṁ sakaḷa-śrī-varan=iṁt-idaṁ niri-
67. sidaṁ Śrīmaj[15]=jaya-staṁbhamaṁ.

WEST FACE

68. Mudam=abhimata-lakshmī bhavya-kōṭī nayaṁ-
69. tī nir=upamāna-guṇa-ratn=ānaṁta-kāṁti-
70. [ḥ] sphuraṁtī sakaḷa-samaya-dharmm=āchā-
71. ra-ramy-ārha-mūla-prakṛitir=amṛita-
72. mūrtir=yakshiṇī-rakshat=ādyaḥ[16] || ◎
73. Svasti samasta-bhuvan=āśraya Śrī Prithvī-va-
74. llabha Mahārāj=ādhirāja Paramēśvara Parama-
75. bhaṭṭaraka Satyāśraya-kuḷa-tilaka Chāḷuky=ābhara-
76. ṇa Śrīmat=Tribhuvanamalladēvaru sukha-saṁka-
77. thā-vinōdadiṁ rājyaṁ geyyuttum=ire tad-ātmajaṁ
78. Samsta-bhuvana-mahanīya-mahim=ōttuṁ-
79. ga Chāḷukya Gaṁga Mahārāj=ādhiraja para-
80. m=ēśvaraṁ vīra-mahēśvaram vijaya-lakshmī-ni-

13-*a*. Read *nodavipan=edeṁde.*
13-*b*. Read *aṁbara.*
14. Read *Tri-Kaḷiṁg=āvani.*
15. Read *niḷisidaṁ śrīmaj=jayastaṁbhamaṁ.*
16. Read *dvaḥ.*

81. vāsa dakshiṇa-dōr=ddaṇḍaṁ dvādaśa-maṇḍa-
82. lika-maṇḍaḷi-mārttāṇḍaṁ pratāp=ā-
83. krāṁta-nava-khaṇḍa-bhūmaṇḍaḷa-rāj-
84. līlā-chamatkṛit=ākhaṇḍaḷaṁ kōdaṇḍa-cha-
85. tur-bhujaṁ sṛiṁgāra-makaradhvajaṁ tri-
86. bhuvana-raṁga-pravarttita-kīrtti-narttakī-
87. narttana-sūtradhāraṁ śaraṅ=āgata-va-
88. jrapr. kāraṁ[16] mūru-rāya-kali-biruda ku-
89. vara-hṛiday=ākaṁpaṁ tyāga-jagaj=jhaṁpan=art thi-
90. jana-chiṁtit=ārttha-chiṁtāmaṇi subha-
91. ṭa-maṇḍaḷika-makuṭa-chūḍāmaṇi Kuṁ-
92. taḷa-rājy=ābhyudaya-kāraṇaṁ bappa
93. na-gandha-vāraṇaṁ Srīman=Mahāmaṁḍal=ēśvaraṁ
94. Chāḷukya-Gaṁga-Permmāḍi-Kumāram Sō-
95. mēśvaradēvaṁ || Āpūrv=ādri-śiḷāśi-
96. khaṇḍa-kaṭakād=āsētu-sīm=āvanē āpāschā-
97. tya-payōnidhēr=upavanād=āramya-hēm=ā-
98. chaḷād[16-a]=ākaḷpam vasudh=ādhipatya-padavīm=ā-
99. ruhyamāṇś=chiraṁ jīyād=apratima-pra-
100. tāpa-vibhavas=Sōmēśvar=orvīśvaraḥ || Viśadha-
101. ra[16-b]-dhurandhara bhujā-parighaṁ Draviḷ-
102. ādhinātha hasty=aśva-padāti-sādhana-vana-ksha-
103. ya-kāraṇa-kōpa-pāvakaṁ sāśvata[17]-kīrtti-
104. yiṁde dhare baṇṇise bāppu Chaḷukya-
105. Gaṁga Sōmēśvara-dēvan=oppidan=i-
106. ḷāvaḷay=ādhipa-rājaputraroḷ ||
107. Tat=pāda-padm=ōpajīvi sam=adhigata-paṁcha-
108. mahāśabda mahāsāmaṁt=ādhipa-
109. ti mahā-prachaṇḍa-daṇḍanāyakaṁ ||
110. Jayati bhuvana-bhūshā-bhūta-vi-
111. khyāta-mūrttiḥ dig=ibha-daśana-līl=āślishṭa-
112. vispashṭa-kīrttiḥ vividha-nṛipa-ma-
113. d=ēbha-bhrāṁta-yūth-āthināthaḥ pra-
114. thita-vitaraṇa Śrī Svāmi-daṇḍ=āthināthaḥ || @ [*]

---

16. Read *prākāraṁ*.
16-a. Read *haim=āchalād*.
16-b. *Viśvadharā*.
17. Read *Śāśvata*.

* I am obliged to Sri H. Sesha Ayyanagar for revising the proofs and suggesting correetions in the text.

APPENDIX

PARĀNTAKA

The forgotten Chālukya-Chōḷa Viceroy of Vēṅgī.

The following is a list of inscriptions in which Parāntaka is mentioned.

No.	Reference.	Date.			Details.
		Śaka year.	Kulottunga I's regnal.	Parantaka's year.	
1	SII. IV. 1248	1034	43		Refers to the payment of 30 *māḍas* to Chakravarti Parāntaka dēvara.
2	,, ,, 1324	1034	43		Refers to Aḍapa Jannaya of Peddalapāku who was *Parāntaka-Brahmādhirāya.* He was a Brahman and the commander - in - chief of Parāntaka, the crest-jewel of the Chāḷukya-*vaṁśa.*
3	,, ,, 737	1037	46 Manmatha.	5	Parāntaka, son of Rājēndra Chōḍa was ruling from Jananāthapura. His titles :—*Sarvalōkāśraya, Vishṇuvardhana,* and *Tribhuvana-Chakravarti.* His *anvayakāmpu* was M.M. Bodda. The latter's brother was Bangena-Bhīma. Refers to the grant of the *raḍḍikam* to the last mentioned by Kulōttunga I.
4	,, ,, 1017	1037	46	—	Mentions Maḍapalli Nūṁkaya, the son of Piṭṭama, who was Parāntaka-Magadharāya. He is said to have been the companion at arms of Parāntaka, 'the lord of the *Śrī* (fortune) of the Chāḷukyan throne, during his expeditions of the conquest of quarters. (*digjaitrayātrā-sakhaḥ*).
5	,, ,, 1029	—	46		Mentions Parāntaka-*Vaḍandīva-rāyaṁḍu,* which probably means the lord of the northern island.
6	,, ,, 1296	Ś.....	47		Mentions Śrī Parānta[ka].
7	,, ,, 1214	Ś.1038			Damaged. Registers a gift to the temple of the God Bhimēśvara by Parāntaka.

No.	Reference.	Date.			Details.
		Śaka year.	Kulottunga I's year.	Parantaka's year.	
8	SII. IV. 1384		47 Simha, Pūrva-paksha, Panchami-Śanāiśchara vāra. Svāti.		May Parāntaka Chakravarti rule the earth as long as the *kulāchala's* bear the earth, the moon....last, and the *Trayi* flourishes in the lotus-navel of Hari. While seated on the excellent couch in the *abhishēka-maṁṭapa*, within the main palace in Jananāthapura, Parāntaka made gifts to the temple of the God Bhīmēśvara, at the request of Savarṇādhirāja, one of his ministers. Vishṇuvardhana Brahmādhirāja was commanded to have the inscription engraved.
9	„ „ 1226		49		Mentions King Parāntaka ruling the Chāḷukyan territory and the temple of the God Parāṅtakēśvara evidently named after the king.
10	„ „ 1385		49		Mentions Parāntaka-Asalarāyaru.
11	„ V. 879	—	—	9	Parāntaka's titles-*Ko-ppara-Kēsarivarman, Tribhuvana Chakravarti*—A gift to the temple of Tiruvālangāḍu.
12	A.R. No. 261 of 1923			9	Parāntaka's titles :—*Ko-ppara-kesarivarman, Tribhuvana Chakravarti.* Registers the gift to a temple at Koyil-Tēvarāyanpēṭṭai, Tanjore Dt., by Araiyūr Kannappan alias Rājakēsari-Pērayan. Historical introduction beginning *Pūmaṅgaivaḷara.*
13	A.R. No. 225 of 1928-9.			9	Parāntaka's titles—*Rājakēsarivarman* and *Chakravarti.* Hist. Intro. *Pūvmaṅgai-vaḷara.*

Besides these thirteen inscriptions, several undated records at Dākshārāmam register the vows of loyalty of his servants to Parāntaka. In these the titles *Sarvalōkāśraya Śrī Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja* and *Konērinmayingoṇḍār* are invariably associated with his name. Oḍḍavāḍi Chōḍayya (S. 99. IV 1262), Śrī Parāntaka Chōḍayya of Vīraghaṭṭa (1270), Sūraya of Bīraghoṭṭa (1271) Bhīmana of Janturnāḍu (1272), Bētayya of Rāpaṟṟu (1273), Vīra Chōḍa of Sarunādu (1274) and Rājādhirāja (1275-A) take the vow that if they entered the service of any one except Parāntaka they might be considered to have given their wives to the other person whom they may undertake to serve.

From the inscriptions cited above, it is evident that Parāntaka was ruling over Vēṅgī from Ś. 1034 to Ś. 1041 (A.D. 1112-3 to 1119-20). As his 5th regnal fell according to No. 3, in Śaka 1037 corresponding to the 46th year Kulōttunga I, his rule must have commenced in Ś. 1033 (A.D. 1111). Though he is said to have been the crest-jewel of the Chāḷukya family and the lord of the *Śrī* of the Chāḷukya throne, and bore the titles *Sarvalōkāśraya* and *Vishṇuvardhana* peculiar to the kings of the Eastern Chāḷukya dynasty, his name as well as his titles *Tribhuvana-Chakravartin*, and *Konērinmayin-koṇḍār* betray his Southern origin. The title *Tribhuvana-Chakravartin* and its abridged form *Chakravartin* associated with his name and method adopted in dating his inscriptions, specially No. 3 clearly indicate that he was the equal and the co-regent of the Chōḷa emperor Kulōttunga I. The words *Rājēndra-Chōḍadēva-tanuju* used in No. 3 with reference to him leave no room for doubt that Parāntaka was the son of Rājendra chōḍa, that is, Kulōttunga I. Therefore, it may be concluded on the authority of these inscriptions that Kulōttunga I nominated his son Parāntaka as his co-regent in A.D. 1110-1111, and having appointed him as his Viceroy sent him to Vēṅgī to govern his northern possessions. Parāntaka held sway over Vēṅgī for eight years until A.D. 1118-19, when he was driven out of the country by Vikramāditya VI.

THE NĀṬAKA-LAKṢAṆA-RATNAKOŚA OF SĀGARANANDIN*

BY

Dr. V. Raghavan

In a paper of this title which I presented at the last meeting of this Conference at Lucknow, I offered a large number of corrections, emendations and critical observations on the text of the work, the NLRK of Sāgaranandin as edited by Prof. Myles Dillon from its single ms[1]. I had stated in my above-mentioned paper[2] that what I had offered was a first instalment. My further intensive study of this text received a sudden acceleration when, taking on hand the task of preparing the English translation of this text which Prof. Dillon had planned, Dr. Murray Fowler of Wisconsin University, U.S.A., came out to India. As many of the further critical observations that I have to make would come in the Notes to that English translation, I shall confine myself in this second instalment to a further set of corrections and emendations of the text which have since suggested themselves to me. These I shall give, for the sake of easy reference, in the same tabular form that I had adopted in my earlier paper.

Page	*Line*	*Text*	*Remarks*
6	126	pramādāḥ syuḥ	Read pramodāḥ syuḥ.
7	142	utpātam	Read utpatram. The imagery of the seed sown, sprouts, etc., requires this emendation.
	143	sandhiṣṭān	Read sandhistham, one compound word with pañca. It qualifies Bīja in singular; there is, on the other hand, nothing in plural for sandiṣṭān to qualify.

* Paper submitted to the Ahmedabad Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, 1953.

1. Oxford University Press, 1937.

2. For the text of this paper, see the Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol. III, 1952.

Page	*Line*	*Text*	*Remarks*
7	144	Praśleṣaḥ	Read śleṣa. See also mere 'śleṣaḥ' in line 145.
10	225	The verse 'Rāvaṇasya vadhe kārye etc.'	This is to be printed in small type being an illustration.
11	240	Sa raṅga-jātasya	Read Sa sandhyaṅga-jātasya. See ms. reading in fn. 'Sa sa' which supports the emendation.
	248	So'ṅkād avagantavyaḥ	Read So'ṅkaḥ sadā avagantavyaḥ. See the verse from Nāṭyaśāstra (18, 15) quoted, upon which these lines 247-8 form gloss.
13	286	Na pratyakṣāṇi santi	Read pratyakṣāṇi bhavanti. See ms. reading in translation. Santi does not fit in the metre.
	296	Kāryo'ṅke saprayogam	Read this citation from Bharata as 'Kāryo aṅkaḥ sa prayogam.'
20	460	Prārthanā-viṣayautsukyam	Read Prārthanā viṣayautsukyam. Prārthanā or seeking is defined as viṣayautsukya or yearning for the thing.
	463	Cittasādhana-sambandhaḥ	Read Binduḥ sādhanasambandhaḥ. Mātṛgupta, in his original analysis of the five Sandhis, gives in each of them three phases: Prārthanā, Ārambha and Bīja in Mukha; Lābha, Prasara and Bindu in Pratimukha; Sambhoga, Udbheda and Patākā in Garbha and so on. The elements Bīja, Bindu and Patākā, the well-known ones regularly come as the third in this analysis; this justifies the emendation of 'Cittasādhanasambandhaḥ', which by itself is also meaningless, into 'Binduḥ sādhanasambandhaḥ.' More clearly, on p. 22, line 501, in the course of the exposition and illustration of these verses of Mātṛ-

Page	Line	Text	Remarks
			gupta, there is express support for my emendation :—Haraṇasya utkhāto binduḥ. Sa eva sādhanasambandhaḥ.
21	479-80	The sentence 'Atra Rājadharmasya,' etc.	Read 'Atra Rājadharmasya ākhyānāt "Yāgasya niṣpattiḥ ṣaṣṭhāṁśaś ca me bhavitā" iti gamanahetucintanam.' The portion in quotation marks is king's speech following that of sage Gālava contained in the verse that precedes. The bit 'Yāgasya niṣpanna-' may be reconstructed also as 'Yāgaś ca niṣpannaḥ' which is more natural, being in juxtaposition with the nominative in the other part of the expression 'Ṣaṣṭhāṁśaś ca.'
22	495	'Tālaketuḥ'	This should be 'Pātālaketuḥ' who is Tālaketu's brother. In the previously quoted Anuṣṭubh Tālaketu the main Pratināyaka is mentioned as killed and in the speech cited (line 496), the speaker referred to calls himself his brother; and the ms. reading in fn. also supports Pātālaketu with just 'Yā' for 'Pā.'
	501 } 515 }	utkhyātaḥ	Read utkhātaḥ.
23	538	arthaḥ sambhavaḥ	Read arthasambhavaḥ. See the Anuṣṭubh of Bharata above on which this is gloss.
24	555 }	kāraṇam	Read karaṇam
27	623 }	,,	,, ,,
	,,	Prākṛtārthaḥ	,, Prakṛtārthaḥ.
	641	Bhagnam devasya Bhīmena	This bit is quotation from Veṇīsaṁhāra where however the current reading in printed texts runs 'Bhagnam Bhīmena bhavataḥ.'
28	655	Nava-pariṇaya-krīḍā	Read 'N. p. vrīḍā.'

Page	Line	Text	Remarks
32	760	Kapaṭādisandh-āne	Read Kapaṭātisandhāne.
33	777	Śatror apaca-yaḥ	This should be Śatror upaca-yaḥ.
	785	Remove under-lining for Vim-arśaḥ.	
34	792	Purorodhair na darśitaḥ	In my previous paper I sugges-ted the emendation 'puroro-dhena darśitaḥ'. It may be 'Puri' (or pura) rodhair nidar-śitaḥ.'
	801 } 802 }	Māyālakṣaṇe	This should be Māyālakṣmaṇe, which is the name of an Act of the play Jānakīrāghava; see also line 1703 for another citation of this Act.
35	836	line 3 of the verse	Read 'Pratidivasam āvirbha-vati naḥ.' 'Āvirbhavati' is locative and goes with 'vimarde.'
37	867	Nirvighnavṛtti-janitam	Read Nirvighnavṛtti janitam.
44	1046	abhinava	Read abhinaya.
45	1062	This line may be read:	Ityācāryamatam adaḥ. Sāraḥ punar ayam.
46	1083	Krīḍā-rūpam	Read Kroḍa-rūpam. The refe-rence is to the Varāha ava-tāra of Viṣṇu.
	1085-6	Māyākṛṣṇaḥ and Utthāpa-yan vā	These should be 'Pāyāt Kṛṣṇaḥ' and 'Utthāpayan vaḥ.' This is in the opening benedictory verse of the play and requires the emen-dation 'Pāyāt' and 'Vaḥ' to mean 'May (such a God) protect you !'
51	1197-8	Tad yathā Yau-gandharāyanaḥ, etc.	This is to be printed with the stroke after Yaugandharā-yaṇa shifted to after Ratnā-valyām; and 'Evam etat' is to be in small type as it is Yaugandharāyaṇa's speech and is to go with the verse in next line 'Dvīpād anyas-mād.'

Page	*Line*	*Text*	*Remarks*
52	1221	Vasantāvatāra-rucim	Read Vasantartāvarucim, meaning 'dislike (arucim) for the spring season (vasantartau).' See the illustrative dialogue cited above on which this is a comment, as also ms. reading in fn.
54	1286	Icchanneva	Anicchanneva would suit context.
55	1296	Kṣamāyutaḥ	Read Akṣamāyutaḥ.
	1302	Sītākṛtā	,, Sītā kṛtā.
	1306	ābharaṇāveṣām	,, -ābharaṇa-veṣām.
59	1410	ujjhatām	,, ujjhyatām. See ms. reading in fn.
60	1414	Kaiścaṇākṣiptaḥ	,, Kaiśca nākṣiptaḥ.
65	1534-5	Capalaiḥ	,, Cāpalaiḥ.
			This verse is independent of the previous line in prose and forms a second illustration.
	1557	Tvapi	Read Tvayi.
66	1569	Guṇātipātasya	,, Guṇātipātas sa.
	1588	Janitā dhairyam	,, Janitādhairyam. It should be 'Adhairyam.'
67	1601-2	-majjam nīla	,, -majjannīla.
	1604	skaladalivivarabhramyad	,, cala - dala-vivara-bhrāmyad (or bhraśyad. See ms. reading in fn. 'sya').
69	1651	Api yāntyāyite	,, Apayāntyāpi te.
	1652	Vyāvartayanmukham	,, Vyāvartya yan mukham.
71	1693	Anyopadeśaiḥ	,, Anyāpadeśaiḥ.
	1703	Mayalakṣaṇāṅke	,, Māyālakṣmaṇāṅke.
	1704	Sākṛṣṭā	,, Sākrustā.
78	1865	Karmavīrasya	,, Karma vīrasya.
	1882	gamaneṣvaṅganādayaḥ	,, gamaneṣṭāṅganādayaḥ.
80	1924	moho vegādayaḥ	,, mohāvegādayaḥ.
	1930	tyāgo vaiśāradyādibhiḥ	,, Tyāgavaiśāradyādibhiḥ.
81	1949	vīra-	,, (a) vīra-

Page	*Line*	*Text*	*Remarks*
82	1962	-prāsāda-	Read -prasāda-
	1964	-prayatādyāśca	,, -pralayādyāśca
86	2054	-vidyādibhiḥ 1 madhyamānam	,, -vidyādibhiḥ madhyamā-nām.
	2058	Mārutiḥ	,, Mārutau.
89	2128	viśalpa	,, viśalya.
90	2155	bhāṣā vīraṭak-kāḥ	May be bhāṣā'bhīraṭakkāḥ.
	2158	Nāyakādiṣu	Read Nāṭakādiṣu.
94	2238	svitkriyā-	,, Svīkriyā.
	2240	yatsatya [mā]-ma-	,, yatsatyam ātma-
95	2264	samvidheyaḥ	,, samvidheya-
96	2287	vastra-varmādi	,, vastra-carmādi See ms. reading in fn.
97	2316	-alikulodbhavaḥ	,, alpa-kulodbhavāh. See ms. reading in fn.
101	2408	tanvyāḥ	,, tanvyā.
103	2482	bhajati sakhī-jane na	,, bhavati sakhījanena.
105	2516	After Sāgarika-yā, put a daṇḍa.	
111	2678	ruṣa	,, ruṣi.
	2681	-sthita-	,, -sthitam.
113	2732	prahārārdham	,, praharārdham.
116	2801	pravṛddha-	Should be nivṛtta-
117	2818	dantakāṣṭha-	,, ,, daṇḍakāṣṭha-
	2821	Sūmāya	,, ,, Sumāya. See also ms. reading in fn.
	2822	Remove daṇḍa after Artha-śṛṅgāraḥ and place it after trayaḥ.	
120	2888	Kāmijanālaṅ-kṛtayā	Read Kāminam alaṅkṛtayā.
	2891	(Chāyā)	Read Mukhacandracandrikayā. The Prakrit should also be restored accordingly.
124	2989	Jaḍāyitum	Read Jaḍāyitam.
125	3018	yad asambhṛ-ta	,, yad asadbhūta-
127	3044	Bhaṭṭinī 1	Read Bhaṭṭini and remove daṇḍa.
130	3128	kṣapānala	Read kṣayānala.

BHARTṚHARI'S INTERPRETATION OF '*GRAHAM SAMMĀRṢṬI*' AND '*PAŚUNĀ YAJETA*.'*

BY

MIMAMSAKARATNA V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, M.A.,
Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.

It is an accepted fact that the *ekatvasaṅkhyā* (number one) conveyed by the accusative case-suffix *am* in the word *graham* in '*graham sammārṣṭi*' is *avivakṣita* (not taken into account) in view of the fact that there are many *grahas* (soma vessels) to be utilised in the Soma sacrifice and that all those *grahas* are to be consecrated by the *sammārga* (cleansing by the cloth *daśāpāvitra*), but the same number conveyed by the instrumental suffix *nā* in the word *paśunā* in '*paśunā yajeta*' is *vivakṣita* (taken into account). What is the criterion by which one can understand that the number conveyed by the case-suffixes is to be taken into account or not?

Mīmāṁsakas explain in *grahaikatvādhikaraṇa* (III. i.) that if *ekatva-saṅkhyā* is *vivakṣita* in *graham sammārṣṭi* the fallacy of *vākyabheda* would arise by taking *graha* and *ekatva* as two separate *uddeśyas* (chief objects) in relation to *sammārga* enjoined by the injunction. Generally the *bhāvanā* to which all other objects are to be related is *eka-karmaka* (possessing one *karma* or *uddeśya*) and when it is explained as possessing two *karmas*, *graha* and *ekatva*, as explained by the two separate words, *graham* and *ekam*, which cannot be mutually associated as being *kārakas*, there would arise *vākyabheda* (sentence-split) as *graham sammārṣṭi* and *ekam sammārṣṭi*. To avoid this, *ekatva* is described as *avivakṣita*.

This explanation is based on the assumption that the injunction *graham sammārṣṭi* is only a *guṇavidhi* in the sense that only the *sammārga* is to be enjoined in relation to *graha* which is already enjoined by another injunction '*grahair juhoti*' as the accessory of the Soma sacrifice. Here *ekatvasaṅkhyā* belongs to the *uddeśya*, the chief object, and if the attributes like *saṅkhyā* are taken into account, then they should

---

* Submitted to the All-India Oriental Conference held at Annamalainagar in 1955. The author unfortunately passed away on 19—8—1956.

be specifically mentioned as given above. This would result in the fallacy of *vākyabheda*. But in the instance *paśunā yajeta* which enjoins *paśu* as the accessory of *yāga*, the *ekatva-saṅkhyā* conveyed by the instrumental suffix is *vivakṣita*, since it belongs to the *upādeya*, viz., *paśu*, newly enjoined. Here it is explained that one and the same case-suffix conveys the *karaṇakāraka* and *ekatva-saṅkhyā* and they are known as mutually related to the *kāraka* as the chief sense and the *saṅkhyā* as its accessory. Though the *saṅkhyā* belongs to the *prātipadikārtha paśu*, yet its relation to the *paśu* is effected only after its relation to the *karaṇa-kāraka* by *samānābhidhāna-śruti* (the same case-suffix). So according to the Mīmāṁsakas the *saṅkhyā* belonging to the *uddeśya* is *avivakṣita* as in the example '*grahaṁ sammārṣṭi*', while the *upādeya-gata-saṅkhyā* (*saṅkhyā* belonging to *upādeya*) is *vivakṣita* as in the instance '*paśunā yajeta*' (cf. IV. 1.)

It is also said that the *saṅkhyā* and the *liṅga* would be *vivakṣita* in these instances when they are needed as the accessories of the chief object and that they would be *avivakṣita* when there is no need (*ākāṅkṣā*) for them. In the instances cited above, in the instance '*paśunā yajeta*' there is *ākāṅkṣā* for the *saṅkhyā* because without it the conception of *paśu* would not be complete while in the instance '*graham sammārṣṭi*' it is not needed since the *graha* is already known as possessing *bahutva* in its utpattivākya (vide *Mīmāṁsākaustubha* I. iii. 3, p. 52).

The same conclusion is explained by the grammarians, chiefly by Bhartṛhari. In the *Jātisamuddeśa* of the third kāṇḍa of his *Vākyapadīya*, he incidentally discusses this point rather very elaborately and it is very interesting to note how he comes to the same conclusion by the same arguments and by his own ways of interpretation.

He first speaks of *saṅkhyā*, *karmatva*, etc., conveyed by the case-suffixes being intended for *śabda-saṁskāra* or being *avivakṣita*; for this he accepts *lakṣaṇā* on those suffixes. So says he:—

> Lakṣaṇā śabdasaṁskāre vyāpāraḥ kāryasiddhaye |
> saṅkhyākarmādiśaktīnām śrutisāmye 'pi dṛśyate || III. 50.

He observes that the *saṅkhyā*, *karman*, etc., are conveyed by one and the same suffix, *śrutisāmye 'pi*, yet they are only for *śabdasaṁskāra* and so *avivakṣita* in view of the fact that they

are either in conflict with the *saṅkhyā* already known or cannot be *karman* or *uddeśya*. In the example *'graham sammārṣṭi'*, *ekatva* is *avivakṣita* because the *grahas* are known in their *utpattivākya* as associated with *bahutva* by the injunction *'grahair juhoti'* or by the injunction *'nava daśa vā grahān gṛhṇiyāt'* which specifically mentions the *saṅkhyā*, *navatva* or *daśatva*. And the injunction *'graham sammārṣṭi'* is only a *guṇa-vidhi* enjoining the *guṇa*, viz., *sammārga*, to the *grahas* already known. So this injunction has no authority to speak of anything in reference to the *saṅkhyā* already known or enjoined by the *utpatti-vidhi*. The reference by the word *graham* in singular number is to be interpreted by *lakṣaṇā* either as *avivakṣita* or meaning *bahutva* such as *navatva* or *daśatva*.

In the instance *'saktūn juhoti'* the *karmatva* conveyed by the accusative is again *avivakṣita* since *saktu* cannot be the *karman* or the *uddeśya* of the *homa*; on the other hand *homa* is the *karma* or *uddeśya* of *saktu*. Though *karmatva* in the sense of *īpsitatamatva* can be interpreted as the best desired object as the chief accessory of *homa*, it cannot be the *karman* of *homa*; if so, nothing would come out from *saktu* if it is concecrated by *homa* since it would be reduced to ashes by *homa*. If on the other hand *saktu* is taken to be accessory of *homa* then at least some *adṛṣṭaphala* can be expected from the *homa* to be produced in the *yajamāna* on the authority of the injunction and *saktus* will have their best utility in the *homa* since *homa-prakṣepa* followed by *tyāga* of the oblation to the deity in question. So it is said that the *karmatva* conveyed by the accusative in *'saktūn juhoti'* is *avivakṣita* and is to be taken in the sense of *karmatva* by *lakṣaṇā*.

On the contrary, in the instances *'paśunā yajeta'* and *'vrīhīn avahanti'* the *ekatva-saṅkhyā* conveyed by the instrumental suffix *nā* in *paśunā* and the *karmatva* conveyed by the accusative in *vrīhīn* are *vivakṣita*; in the former it belongs to the *utpattivākya* of *paśu*; when the *paśu* is first enjoined as the accessory of the *yāga* it is first known by the instrumental singular as associated with the *karaṇatvakāraka* and with the *ekatva-saṅkhyā* and it is not in apposition with any other *saṅkhyā* as in the case of *graha*. And the enjoining and the conception of a *dravya* as an accessory will not be complete without its association with a *kāraka*, *saṅkhyā*, *liṅga*, etc. So whatever things are known from the word *paśunā* are

to be taken as enjoined and *vivakṣita*. Hence the rule, *Upādeyagatā saṅkhyā vivakṣitā*. Similarly in the injunction '*vrīhīn avahanti*' the *karmatva* is *vivakṣita* since it is known already as a *prakṛtidravya* of the main oblation *puroḍāśa* in the *darśapūrṇamāsa* sacrifice by the injunction '*vrīhibhir yajeta*.'

If *saṅkhyā* is however conveyed by a separate stem like *eka, dvi*, etc., then it is *vivakṣita*, since it is done by a separate effort. In the example '*tām caturbhir abhrim ādatte*' the word *caturbhiḥ* enjoins the *catuṣṭva-saṅkhyā* in reference to the mantras and so it is *vivakṣita*. It therefore means that all the four mantras combined are to be utilised in the *abhryādāna*. But in the example '*yasyobhayam havir ārtim ārcchet aindram pañcaśarāvam odanam nirvapet*', the words *ubhayam* and *haviḥ* are taken in the sense of a group of oblations and so the sense of *ubhaya* (both) is not *vivakṣita*, since even when one of the two oblations is lost the group can be said to be lost.

Here the Mīmāṁsakas explain *vākyabheda* fallacy if *ubhaya* is *vivakṣita* as the attribute of *havis*, since both of them (*ubhayam* and *haviḥ*) being *kārakas* cannot be mutually related, as being the qualifier of the other unless it is found in a compound like '*aśvābhidhānīm*' (vide P. M. VI. iv. 22).

From what has been said, it can be observed that in instances where *saṅkhyā* is conveyed by the case-suffix, it is *vivakṣita* if two conditions are found: (i) *pūrvam anirjñātatvam*—it is not already known or enjoined by any other injunction, and (ii) *apradhānatvam*—state of not being a chief object or *uddeśya* in the injunction. This is what is emphasized by Bhartṛhari in the following lines:

yajeta paśunety atra saṁskārasyāpi sambhave |
yathājātis tathaikatvam sādhanatvena gamyate || III. 55
anyatrāvihitasyaiva sa vidhiḥ prathamam paśoḥ |
kriyāyām aṅgabhāvaś ca tathaitat syāt vivakṣitam|| III. 57

In the example *paśunā yajeta*, which is a *guṇavidhi* in the sense that the *paśu* is newly enjoined as the accessory of the sacrifice, the *paśu* has not been already enjoined by any other injunction: here the first condition, *pūrvam anirjñātatva*, is satisfied. Again in this injunction, the *yāga* is the *uddeśya* of the *bhāvanā* and *paśu* is only a *sādhana* or *karaṇa*; so it is *apradhāna* in relation to the *uddeśya*, namely, *yāga*: so the second condition, *apradhānatva*, is also found. So the *saṅkhyā*

conveyed by the *ekavacana* in the word *paśu* is *vivakṣita*. Here Mīmāṁsakas say that the *upādeyagatasaṅkhyā* is *vivakṣita* (vide P.M. IV. i. 11). But in the injunction *'graham sammārṣṭi'*, which enjoins *sammārga* in relation to *graha* as *uddeśya* which is already known or enjoined by another injunction *'grahair juhoti'*, etc., these two conditions are not found, since *graha* is *uddeśya*; so it is *pradhāna* and it has been already enjoined or known as the accessory of the *soma-yāga* by another injunction. So there is no *pūrvam ajñātatva*. Here the *saṅkhyā* conveyed by *bahuvacana* is *avivakṣita*. This is what is explained by Bhartṛhari in the kārikās:

> grahās tv anyatra vihitā bhinnasaṅkhyāḥ pṛthak pṛthak |
> prājāpatyā navety evamādibhedasamanvitāh || (III. 58)
> aṅgatvena pratītānām sammārge tv aṅginām punaḥ |
> nirdeśam prati yā saṅkhyā sā katham syād vivakṣitā ||
> (III. 59).

What has been said here is based on the chief nature of the object (*vastu-niṣṭham arthaprādhānyam*), i.e., *graha* is the chief object (*uddeśya*) of the *bhāvanā* which has *sammārga* enjoined as its own *karaṇa* while the *paśu* is the *karaṇa* and therefore *apradhāna* of the *bhāvanā* which has the *yāga* as its *pradhāna* or *uddeśya*, Bhartṛhari then proceeds to explain the *prādhānya* and *aprādhānya* as known from the *śabda*. He consideres what is newly enjoined by an injunction is *pradhāna* and what is known as the *uddeśya*, and *bhāvanā* (as it has already been known by some other injunction) is *apradhāna*. He says:—

> apūrvasya vidheyatvāt prādhānyam avasīyate |
> vihitasya parārthatvād jñeyabhāvaḥ partīyate || (III. 69.)

In *'paśunā yajeta' paśu* is *vidheya* and is newly enjoined as the *karaṇa* of the *yāga* and here it is *pradhāna* and its *saṅkhyā* is *vivakṣita*. But in *'graham sammārṣṭi'*, *sammārga* is *vidheya* and *graha* is already known and as such *uddeśya*, and its *saṅkhyā* is *avivakṣita*. This is explained in the kārikā:—

> sammārgasya vidheyatvād anyatra vihite grahe |
> vidhivākye śrutā saṅkhyā lakṣaṇāyām na bādhyate ||
> (III. 70.)

It explains that the *saṅkhyā nine* or *ten* enjoined by the *grahotpattivākya* is not sublated by the *ekatva-saṅkhyā* in the *sammārga-vidhi* since it belongs to the uddeśya and as such pradhāna. So the ekatva-saṅkhyā in *'graham sammārṣṭi'* is to be taken by *lakṣaṇā* in the sense of *bahutva*, nine or ten, as enjoined in the *utpattivākya*. In the instance of *paśu*, one and the same *saṅkhyā*, *ekatva*, is known by its *utpatti-vākya*, even if *'paśunā yajeta'* is taken to be the *yāgotpatti-vākya*. This interpretation of Bhartṛhari also goes consistently with the Mīmāṁsaka view that the *upādeya-gata-saṅkhyā* is *vivakṣita* and the *uddeśya-gata-saṅkhyā* is *avivakṣita*.

A FAMILY OF PĀŚUPATA GṚHASTHAS AT JAMBUKĒŚVARAM.

BY

DR. T. V. MAHALINGAM, *Professor of Archaeology, University of Madras.*

The Pāśupatas were one of the ancient Śaiva sects in India, who, while being strict worshippers of Paśupati, followed some repulsive practices.[1] But in course of time, and particularly after the Hindu revival in South India through the twin streams of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism led by the *Nāyaṉārs* and the *Āḻvars*, the growing influence of the Vedānta school, and the increasing importance of temples and *maṭhas* in the religious life of the country, the Pāśupatas like the Kāpālikas and the Kāḷamukhas appear to have adopted mild and less repulsive ways in their religious practices. They appear to have become more and more interested in the organisation of *maṭhas* and through them the propagation of Śaiva faith. References to a number of such *maṭhas* are found in inscriptions, and some of them had a number of branches established in different parts of the country.

One of them deserves mention here, namely the *Akhilanāyakī tirumaḍam* at Tiruvāṉakkāval or Jambukēśvaram in Tirichirappalli District, which was an important centre of the Pāśupata cult. Its history may be traced back to at least the second quarter of the thirteenth century A.D. when it is said to have been presided over by one Jīyar Viśvēśvara Śivācārya who was the head of the Goḷaki maṭha, a migrant from the province of Rāḍhā, and the preceptor of the Kākatīya king Gaṇapati. According to an inscription of A.D. 1240 a village called Kumāramangalam in the former Pudukkōṭṭai State was granted to it as a *maḍappuṟam*.[2] The head of the *maṭha* was a celibate, like the heads of many other *maṭhas*, leading an austere life. He appears to have been in charge of the management of the temple at Jambukēśvaram enjoying in it

1. See R. G. Bhandarkar, *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems*, p. 112; T. A. Gopinatha Rao, *Hindu Iconography*, Vol. II, pp. 21-3.

2. *Inscriptions of the Pudukkoṭṭai State*, No. 196.

the rights of *arccanai, tirukkanśāttu, kōvilkēlvi, kaṇakkeluttu, muddirai* and *mura-śuvantiram.* In Ś. 1506 (A.D. 1584) an important change was made in the time honoured custom of choosing a suitable person to be in charge of the management of the temple. An inscription dated in that year which purports to be a *tirumugam* issued by Caṇḍeśvara records the appointment of a Candraśēkhara Guru Uḍaiyār, a Pāśupata gṛhastha as manager of the temple. It is said that the *Pāśupatavratam* and the rights of *arccaṇai, tirukkaṇśāttu, kōvilkēlvī, kaṇakkeluttu, muddirai* and *muraśuvantiram* were in the enjoyment of the heads of the *maṭha* in lineal succession from *guru* to *śiṣya.* But "as according to the *Parāśarasamhitā* (Mādhavīya commentary) long term celibacy, the use of *kamaṇḍalu,* the performance of human and horse sacrifices and drinking of spirituous liquors are deprecated for Brahmans in the Kali age; as according to the *Kālāgni Rūdropaniṣad,* a learned Brahman is desirable, be he a *Brahmacāri, Gṛhastha, Vānaprastha* or *Sannyāsi*; as according to the *Sanatkumārasamhitā* the *Pāśupata vrata* is enjoined for twelve years on a true devotee of Paśupati; as *agni* is not allowed for *gṛhasthas, upanayana* is prescribed for *śrotriya-brahmacāris* and a period of twelve months is enough for...; as according to the *Śaura samhitā* a period of twelve years or a year, or a half year, or yet a further half of it or even a shorter term of twelve days is prescribed as a concession to the *gṛhasthas*; as Upamanyu, Dadhīci, Agastya, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, who were all married men observed the *Pāśupata vrata*; as according to the *Ṛk Brāhmaṇa,* a man is absolved of all his *ṛṇas* by begetting a son, and a man who is childless does not attain salvation and so the three-fold *ṛṇas* have somehow to be worked out; as according to the *Śrutis* and the *Smṛtis* the performance of *yajña* is obligatory on a householder from the tenth day of his marriage, and performance of some obligatory rites on special occasions and at certain special places is compulsory; as it is stated in the *Yajñakaraṇa* (—chapter) that he who does not perform certain rites is considered an excommunicated Brahman; and as according to *Śivājñā* (command of Śiva) the ordinances of *Śruti* and *Smṛti* are to be closely followed and a transgressor is considered an enemy of Śiva, Candraśēkhara Guru Uḍaiyār was commanded to be a *gṛhastha-pāśupata* (*i.e.* Pāśupata though married) and conduct *yajña* and other rites and enjoy

privileges in the temple mentioned earlier in lineal succession of son, grandson and so on."[3] It was provided, however, that an elder, both by age and learning, should be the head of the *maṭha* (*adhiṣṭhāna*) and maintain the brotherhood of disciples in the *maṭha*. The difference between the old custom and the new arrangement lay in the fact that while in the former days the head of the *maṭha* was a celibate and his rights in the temple passed on from *guru* to *śiṣya*, under the new arrangement he was a *Pāśupata gṛhastha* and his rights in the temple passed on from father to son. Since

---

3. *Annual Report of South Indian Epigraphy*, 1936-7, No. 135; part II, para 79. The relevant portion of the text of the inscription reads as follows:—

50. sāvadhikamāga
51. gṛhastha Pāśupatam anuṣṭiccu yajñādi karumaṅga-
52. ḷum naḍattikkoṇḍu Jembunāthar Akhilāṇ-
53. ḍa Īśuriyār arccaṉai tirukkaṇśāttu kōvil
54. kēḻvi kaṇakkeḻuttu muddirai muṟaśuvantiram
55. uḷpaḍa naḍattikkoṇḍu putra-pautra parampa-
56. raiyāgi naḍakkumpaḍikku nam bhaktarāṉa
57. Uḍaiyaṟkku kaṭṭaḷai-iṭṭapaḍiyināle ācandrārka-
58. māga putra-pau-
59. tra parampa-
60. raiyāga naḍa-
61. kkak-kaḍavadāga-
62. vum [||]* naḍakkum i-
63. ḍattu vayo vṛ-
64. ddharumāy vi-
65. dyā vṛddharumā-
66. ṉa pēr adhiṣṭhā-
67. nattukku iru-
68. ndu maṟṟai sa-
69. ho darar kkum
70. asanavasanā-
71. digaḷ naḍattik-
72. koṇḍu pu-
73. tra-paramparai-
74. yāga adhiṣṭhāna-
75. m paripālanam
76. paṇṇi naḍatti-
77. kkoṇḍu vara-
78. kaḍavargaḷāga-
79. vum.

the change was novel and vital it was sought to be justified by a number of religious texts relating to it.

Judged by the results, the change appears to have been for good. Candraśēkhara Guru Uḍaiyār also known as Śrīkaṇṭha Ākāśavāsi Candraśēkhara Vājapēya Yāji[4] was evidently a much respected person at Jambukēśvaram and the first of at least three generations of scholar-managers of the temple who are recorded to have done much for it, and worked for the maintenance and spread of the necessary spiritual atmosphere in it. It is not known how long Candraśēkhara Guru Uḍaiyār managed the temple. After his death, his son Sāgnijit Sarvajit Mahāvratayāji Mahādēva Makhin held the office. He is said to have died in the cyclic year Viśvāvasu.[5] This year corresponds to Ś. 1527 or 1587=A.D. 1605 or 1665. Since Sadāśiva Makhin succeeded to the place in Ś. 1576 (A.D. 1654), it may be taken that Mahādēva Makhin died in 1605 itself.[5-a]

---

4. 64 of 1937-38.

5. 50 of 1937-38. An inscription on the north wall of the Śaṅkarālaya shrine in the temple records the death of the wife of Mahādēva Makhīndra (Makhin) in the year Kāḷayukti, corresponding to Ś. 1540 or 1600, A.D. 1618 or 1678. Since the Śaṅkarālaya shrine appears to have been constructed by Sadāśiva Makhin (A.D. 1654-1714), the son of Mahādēva Makhin, it may probably be taken that she outlived her husband for a long time and died in A.D. 1678.

5-a. A copper plate record dated Śaka 1584 Subhakṛt Caitra, Śu. 15 Monday Hasta (24th March 1662) said to have been issued during the reign of Tirumalai Nāyaka of Madurai registers gift of lands in several villages to Mahādēva Dīkṣitulu of the Kauṇḍinya gotra and of the lineage of Śrīkaṇṭha-Ākāśavāsi (*guru* of the Nāyaka) and certain privileges and honours in the four temples of Jambukēśvaram, Mātṛbhūtēśvaram, Rāmēśvaram and Cokkanāthapuram. (C.P. 25 of 1937-38). But the genuineness of the record is not above suspicion, since as said earlier, Mahādēva Makhin appears to have died in A.D. 1605 and therefore he could not have been a contemporary of Tirumalai Nāyaka. Further, the record is dated A.D. 1662 while Tirumalai Nāyaka himself had died in A.D. 1659 itself. But the statements made in it that the members of the family were *Kulagurus* of the Nāyak rulers of Madurai and that Śrīkaṇṭha-Ākāśavāsi had been a recipient of five villages from his disciple Viśvanātha Nāyaka are interesting.

Sadāśiva Makhin also called Sādāśiva Dīkṣita or Sadāśiva Vājapēya and the son of Mahādēva Makhin is said to have been appointed *Dharmakartā* of the Jambukēśvaram temple in the cyclic year Jaya,[6] apprently corresponding to Ś. 1576—A.D. 1654. If his father died in A.D. 1605, and he himself succeeded to his place in A.D. 1654 it is not known what happened to it for about fifty years (A.D. 1605-1654). Possibly Sadāśiva Dīkṣita had an elder brother who filled the place during the period, and after his death in A.D. 1654 he succeeded to the office. The surmise is possible on account of the fact that *tirumugam* given by Cāṇḍēśa of the temple to Candraśēkhara Uḍaiyār in Ś. 1506 mentions that the eldest member of the family was to be the head of the *maṭha* and the *dharmakartā* of the temple. Otherwise it is difficult to explain the gap.[7]

An undated inscription in the temple at Jambukēśvaram mentions that Ayyā Sadāśiva Dīkṣitarayyaṉ gained fame by administering (apparently the *maṭha* and the temple) for sixty years.[8] Since he was made *dharmakartā* of the temple in A.D. 1654 it may be taken that he held the office till A.D. 1714. Sadāśiva Dīkṣita was a distinguished member of the family and his scholarship, spiritual activities and services to the temple are mentioned in a number of inscriptions.

He was a great votary of Śambhu or Śiva and believed in the spiritual efficacy of *Śivanāmatraya*, namely, Śiva, Śambhu and Mahādēva, by reason of which he is referred to in some inscriptions as *Śivanāmatraya Prakāśakaḥ*.[9] He erected pillars (*Śivanāmatraya jaya stambha*) in the *utsava-maṇḍapa*, another in the *maṇḍapa* at the southern entrance into the fourth *prākāra* in the temple[10] and a third in the Śaṅkarālaya. He also expounded the sanctity of the three

6. 57 of 1937-38.

7. However, he is not referred to in any inscription at Jambukēśvaram so far collected. Nor is there any reference to him in the inscriptions of Sadāśiva Dīkṣita, some of which mention his father Mahādēva Makhin and his grandfather Candraśēkhara Guru Uḍaiyār only. Of course there was no need to mention his elder brother in the pedigree he was giving of himself.

8. 130 of 1936-37.

9. 51, 53 and 56 of 1937-58.

10. 17 of 1937-38; 129 of 1936-37; 66 of 1937-38.

names of *Śivanāmatrayam* and the Śaiva cult in general.[11] Further he made a number of structural additions to the temple. Among them mention may be made of the *Śadāśiva maṇḍapa* in front of the Naṭarāja shrine,[12] the shrine of Harihara,[13] a *maṇḍapa* for Candraśēkharasvāmin,[14] the *dārukāvanavilāsam*[15] besides some in the shrines of Śaṅkareśa and Mātṛbhūtēśvara.[16] An inscription on the north wall of the Śaṅkarālaya in the temple mentions the completion of apparently the shrine by Sadāśiva.[17]

Sadāśiva Dīkṣita was performer of a number of sacrifices. Reference is made to his performance, for instance, of the *Pāśuka cāturmāsya* and *Vājapēya* in the *sannidhi* of Śaṅkarēśa when he made a gift of land for the institution of a twilight service (*pradoṣa kaṭṭaḷai*) in the shrine.[18] Another inscription dated in Ānanda (A.D. 1674) records that he performed the *Vājapēya*.[19]

Sadāśiva Makhin was a scholar too. He had good mastery over the Śāstras and so he is referred to as *Śāstra-viśārada*.[20] He is mentioned as the author of a number of works such as the *Dārukāvanavilāsam, Akalaṅka Śrīkaṇṭha-nāṭaka vilāsam, Pārvatī kalyāṇanāṭakam, Taṅgarāja vilāsām*,[21] *Śaṅkarācārya stōtram* or *Śivagītā, Gurumuṉivar Stōtram* and the *Pañcanadastōtram*.[22]

We do not know the subsequent history of this family. An undated inscription in the temple at Jambukēśvaram assignable to the eighteenth century records the perpetual devotion of a Mahāvrata Ayyā Subrahmaṇya son of Rāmakṛṣna Dīkṣita. Obviously they were also Pāśupatas as may be inferred from the prefix *mahāvrata* before the

---

11. 51, 52 and 61 of 1937-38.
12. 23 of 1937-38.
13. 53 of 1937-38.
14. 15 of 1937-38.
15. 70 of 1937-38.
16. 59 of 1937-38.
17. 68 of 1937-38.
18. 64 of 1937-38.
19. 16 of 1937-38.
20. 131 of 1936-37.
21. 70 of 1937-38.
22. 52 of 1937-38.

name of Ayyā Subrahmaṇya. Probably they continued the spiritual traditions of the family and were devout scholars living at Jambukēśvaram. From a few records of the last century belonging to the Śri Śankarācārya maṭha at Kumbhakonam it appears that they were the disciples of that *maṭha* and recognised its right to do *tāṭanka pratiṣṭhā* to Goddess Akhilāṇḍeśvarī in the Temple at Tiruvānaikkāval.[23]

23. I am grateful to the Government Epigraphist for India for enabling me to consult the texts of the inscriptions referred to in the paper.

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

5—8—1955

At a meeting of the K. S. R. Institute on 5th August, '55, Sri T. N. Ramachandran, Joint D. G. of Archaeology, Government of India, spoke on *Indian Art: Its correct appreciation.* The lecture was illustrated by lantern slides. Sri N. Raghunatha Iyer presided.

17—9—1955

Eleventh Foundation Day

The Eleventh Foundation Day of the Institute was celebrated on 17th Sept. 1955 under the presidentship of Sri S. Anantaramakrishnan, when Dr. J. Filliozat of the College de France, Paris, and the French Indological Institute, Pondicherry, delivered the Foundation Day Address. Prof. Filliozat said that it was a great honour for him to address the members of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute on the occasion of its eleventh Foundation Day. He said he brought to the Institute the greetings and good wishes of the French Indologists and French Orientalist organisations, the Societe Asiatique, Musee Guimet, Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient, Institut de civilization indienne, Sorbonne, College de France, Ecole des Langues Orientales, Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Ecole de Louvre and the French Institute of Indology, Pondicherry. He recalled the association of Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, in whose name the Institute was founded, with his own *guru* in Paris, Sylvain Levi, and observed that he felt a sense of delight that day that their French *paramparā* was not quite foreign to the *paramparā* at Madras. He paid also a tribute to the *Journal of Oriental Research*, quoting Sylvain Levi's observation about its characteristic "Indian flavour, its proper *Rasa*".

His lecture on the occasion, '*Ancient relations between Indian and foreign astronomical systems*' is published elsewhere in this issue of the journal.

The occasion was availed of to unveil in the Institute premises a portrait of Sri Chittoor Rajagopalachariar who gave the initial donation of Rs. 5,000 to the Institute to start the New Method Sanskrit Classes. The portrait was presented

by N. Raghunatha Iyer and unveiled by Sri S. Ananta-ramakrishnan.

19—12—1955

Jointly with the Madras Sanskrit Academy, the Institute held a public meeting to condole the death of Sri R. Narayana Iyer, I.C.S., a respected Member of the Institute and a profound scholar in *Rāmāyaṇa*.

16—1—1956

At a meeting held an 16th January, 1956, Mr. Jean Herbert of the UNO and Lecturer in Comparative Religion and Mythology in the University of Geneva spoke on "Hindu Mythology." Introducing the lecturer as the author of more than a hundred books, Dr. V. Raghavan spoke of the service done by Mr. Herbert in interpreting to the cultured public in Europe the tenets of Hinduism and aquainting them with the modern Saints of India like Ramakrishna Paramahamsa, Swami Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, and Ramana Maharshi.

Mr. Herbert spoke of the greatness of the myths and episodes appearing in Hindu scriptures and expressed the view that a careful study of the same would lead to an easy understanding of the intricacies of modern science, philosophy and religion. Pointing out that for him a myth was a description of an authentic spiritual experience which a seer or Rishi had given, Mr. Herbert said that in the oldest scriptures, the Vedic *samhitās*, very often the experience of the sages had been given in fewer words, say by means of *mantras*, while the myths appearing in *Purāṇas* and *Itihāsas* were more explanatory and went into details. A myth, he said, covered a very high spiritual experience from which many rules and laws could be deduced, learnt and applied to different branches of human learning and activity.

Explaining with suitable illustrations the methods he adopted in trying to understand these myths and episodes, Mr. Herbert said that he had never resorted to comparative mythology, since they, in the West, had very little basis or background to proceed with such a comparative study, nor had he attempted at comparative etymology as he had never seen it yielding fruitful results. He concentrated his study in trying to find out where, when and how significant words and names

recurred and in what text. He also studied deeply the simila-rity of situations in the various myths and episodes.

The lecturer said in conclusion that he believed that a study of the myths in this manner might be accepted as having practical value and might even help to rehabilitate the scrip-tures in the eyes of many people who scoffed at them. Any time spent on such a study would not be a waste. He desired that the scholars in India would devote some attention to this particular method of approach.

Sri K. S. Ramaswami Sastri thanked the lecturer for his illuminating speech and for the services he was doing for India and her spiritual mission.

THE ADVAITA SABHA

The Advaita Sabhā is a scholarly institution founded and fostered by the Kāmakoṭi Śaṅkara Pīṭha of Kanchi and Kumbhakonam. It was founded towads the end of 1895 by the grand-preceptor of the present Kāmakoṭi Śaṅkarācārya at Kumbhakonam where the Kanchi Math had been functioning in the recent past. The object of the society was to promote the study of Advaita Śāstra; among its early promoters were Dewan Seshayya Sastri, Sir S. Subrahmanya Iyer and Prof. K. Sundararama Iyer, and among the Pandits who took part in its activities were Mm. Tyagaraja (Rāju) Sastrigal of Mannargudi, Mm. Painganadu Ganapati Sastrigal, Mm. Harihara Sastrigal, Mm. Balakrishna Sastrigal, Mm. Karun-gulam Krishna Sastrigal, Mm. Yajnaswami Sastrigal, Mm. Venkatasubba Sastrigal and Mm. Vallur Subrahmanya Sastrigal. In the galaxy of Pandits who have sustained the work of the Sabhā in recent years are Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastrigal, Mm. Chinnaswami Sastrigal, Pt. Tethiyur Subrahmanya Sastrigal, Mm. N. S. Anantakrishna Sastrigal, Pt. Polakam Sundara Sastrigal, Pt. K. A. Lakshmana Sastrigal, Pt. Polakam Rama Sastrigal, Pt. T. V. Lakshmi-narayana Sastrigal, Pt. T. A. Venkatesvara Dikshitar, Pt. T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar, Pt. V. Subrahmanya Sastrigal and Pt. S. Subrahmanya Sastrigal. The present Secretaries of the Sabhā are Messrs S. Vaidyanatha Iyer and K. Bala-subrahmanya Iyer. The Sabhā publishes a periodical called *Brahma Vidyā* and holds annual sessions at different centres in the South. It conducts annual examinations in Advaita and runs also regular schools and classes for teaching Advaita,

SCULPTURAL REPRESENTATIONS OF

SRI SANKARACHARYA

in different temples at Kanchipuram

1
EKĀMRANATHA'S
Temple, Mavadi.

2
VARADARAJA'S
Temple, Southern Side of
Anantasaras, 4 Pillared Mandap.

3
SIVALINGAMEDU.

4
KANCI KAMAKSI'S
Temple, Utsavar Shrine.

5
KANCI BHANGARU
KAMAKSI.

6
PUNYAKOTI,
Temple.

7
VARADARAJA'S
Temple, Devi's Shrine.

8
VAIKUNTA PERUMAL,
Temple.

9
KANCI KACCAPESWARA'S
Temple.

10
KUMARA
KOSTAM.

11
SIVALINGA
MEDU.

The Sabhā celebrated its Diamond Jubilee in March, 1956, for a week from the 18th to 24th, in the immediate presence of H. H. Sri Chandrasekharendra Sarasvati Svamigal, the present Sankaracharya of the Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha, at Sivasthana, a Saiva shrine on the outskirts of Kanchi where the Swamiji has been staying for the past few years. The gathering composed of Pandits, scholars and votaries of the Math was welcomed by Swami Ishtasiddhendra Sarasvati of the Upanishad Brahma Math of Kanchi; the sixtyfirst session of the Sabhā was then inaugurated by H. H. Sri Sankaracharya Svamigal of Kāmakoṭi Pīṭha. Besides general examinations, there were also tests in specific Advaita classics. There were also discourses and *vākyārthas*. The concluding day's proceedings were marked by an address on Advaita by H. H. Sri Sankaracharya himself, and special presents to the Pandits who had assembled at the session.

To commemorate the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee, the Sabhā brought out two publications: *Drāviḍātreyadarśanam* and *Caturmatasārasaṅgraha*, both by Pt. Polakam Rama Sastrigal.

A *Souvenir* and a *Commemoration Volume* were also issued on the occasion, carrying several articles in Sanskrit and English on Advaita works, authors and scholars; special mention must be made of the article on Ādi Śaṅkara and his intimate association with Kanchi which is borne out especially by a large number of carvings of Śaṅkara's image in the different temples of Kanchi; these most interesting series of carvings of Śaṅkara at Kanchi which H. H. the present Sankaracharya has brought to light have been reproduced here from the *Diamond Jubilee Souvenir* of the Advaita Sabhā.

V. R.

THE VENKATARAMANA AYURVEDIC COLLEGE

During the year, the Venkataramana Ayurvedic College and Dispensary celebrated its Golden Jubilee. The Institution was founded by the late V. Krishnaswami Iyer, whose far-sighted generosity and patriotic fervour were responsible for many nation-building activities, the foundation of cultural institutions and the discovery of persons who played a formative role in the life of the country and its culture in the last

half a century. The time was opportune for resuscitating the study of Indian medicine by founding an institution in the city of Madras and this Krishnaswami Iyer did towards the end of 1905. From the beginning medicines, which were prepared in the manufactory of the institution, were given free to the poor and were made available for price to those who could afford to buy. The Institution had the advantage of the guidance of two highly competent Ayurvedic physicians who were its heads, Pt. Venkatasubba Sastrigal and Vaidyaratna N. V. Krishna Warriar. Among the distinguished Professors of the College were Pt. Bharata Sastrigal and K. G. Natesa Sastrigal. The College course was in due course affiliated to the Ayurveda Siromani title examination of the Madras University. There are Students' Quarters attached to the College for which Sri N. R. Iyer made the necessary contribution.

Modern surgery is also taught to the students by an allopathic doctor and among the many *ad hoc* donations received by the Institution is to be mentioned the scholarship which Sir S. Varadachariar was giving for enabling a doctor qualified in allopathy to undergo a course in Ayurveda.

The popularity and usefulness of the Institution are testified by the great demand which is now seen for its medicines and the branches which it has opened in the city itself and the districts. The products of the College are all well-employed and are now spread all over South India; both on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee and earlier, the old students of the College made donations to their *Alma mater*.

The Golden Jubilee was fittingly celebrated on 29th January 1956. There was a gathering of Ayurvedic scholars, old students as well as those outside among whom is to be mentioned Vaidyaratna Kaviraj Sri Pratāpa Simha, Director of Ayurvedic Studies, Banaras Hindu University. The public meeting held to felicitate the College on fifty years of its useful existence was presided over by the Governor of Madras, Sri Sri Prakasa. A Golden Jubilee Souvenir was also issued by the Institution which besides being a record of the history of the College and its students, staff and management, carries eleven articles in English, Sanskrit and Tamil on different aspects of Ayurveda.

We extend to the Institution our felicitations and congratulate those responsible for the management of the institution. The Institution was fortunate in enjoying for several years the devoted attention of Sri A. Krishnaswami Iyer (Secretary, 1916-37). Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer, the founder's son, has not only been looking after the College as Secretary from 1937 onwards but has been continuously working for greater recognition for the cause of Ayurveda at the hands of the public and the authorities and for the upgrading of Ayurvedic studies and research in Universities.

V. R.

OBITUARY NOTICES

F. W. Thomas

The seniormost Sanskrit Professor of Great Britain, F. W. Thomas, passed away at his country home, Bodicote, Banbury, on May 6, 1955. Eighty-nine at the time of his death, this doyen of Sanskrit studies in England was continuing his research work to his last days.

Prof. Thomas began his Sanskrit work in the India Office Library and later occupied the Boden Chair of Sanskrit at Oxford.

In 1937-38, when he was last in India, he presided over the Trivandrum Session of the All-India Oriental Conference and delivered lectures at many Indian universities. He received many honours in India, including a Commemoration Volume in honour of his 72nd birthday. In Europe, many Universities and Oriental Institutes honoured him.

There is hardly a branch of Sanskrit and Indology to which Prof. Thomas did not make his distinguished contribution. He was equally at home in epigraphy and the philology of obscure Central Asian languages and in Nyāya, Tibetan or Buddhism. More than a dozen works and two hundred papers stand to his credit. When I met him at his home in 1953, he said he was still hoping to bring out the English translation of the *Dinakarī*; it is hoped his literary executors or those near him would throw some light on the condition in which he left the ms. materials pertaining to this important and difficult undertaking of his.

V. R.

R. Narayana Aiyer

Students of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and members of the Sanskrit Academy and K. S. R. Institute sustained irreparable loss in the demise of R. Narayana Aiyer, I. C. S. (Retd.). Mr. Narayana Aiyer who passed away early in December, 1955, spent his years of retirement specialising in the study of Vālmiki's epic. He gained a most throughgoing mastery of the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and bringing to bear on the interpretation of the story and construction of the epic, his judical acumen and scholarship in Greek, Latin and

English classics, he produced a series of studies of Vālmīki's art and production, which were alike remarkable for their minute analysis and delightful literary flavour. Unfortunately only a few of these he published in English, *e.g.*, those that appeared in the pages of this journal; adopting the *maṇi-pravāla* diction of the famous Vaishnavite commentators, he published a larger number of such studies in Tamil in the *Amritalahari* of P. B. Annangaracharlar of Kanchipuram. To the Madras Sanskrit Academy, he did signal service by helping it to edit and bring out the Rāmāyaṇa Lectures of the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.

During his last years he was proposing to bring out a consolidated volume of his studies on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and it is hoped that his friends and relatives would arrange to collect and publish his papers, the bulk of which is in manuscript.

The following is a tribute paid to the late Narayana Aiyer by Sri *Sāhitī Vallabha* T. Sundaracharlar, himself a master and gifted exponent of Vālmīki:

"My acquaintance with the late scholar and savant started more than twenty years ago. I had heard of him vaguely as a senior member of the I.C.S. but it was a pleasant surprise when he sought me out and wished to know my reaction to an essay on Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā which he had prepared. He told me that he had already submitted it to the notice of the late Messrs. Sivaswami Aiyar and Sundaram Iyer, and that it was the former who had asked him to show it to me. When I perused that essay, I was struck with the novel form in which he had prepared it, following the technique of a case heard in court and governed by the rules of procedure as laid down in the Evidence and other Acts. But the originality of the method was even more strikingly sustained by the brilliance and subtlety of the exposition. The essay revealed a mastery of the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which staggered me by its width and depth. The canons of textual study as perfected by Western scholars were utilised from unsuspected points of view leading to the illumination of dark corners. An acquaintance that began thus continued till the other day when he made his last visit to me in the course of which he told me how he had prepared an essay on the character and role of *Mārīca* in the epic, and how he hoped to present it at an early date to the Samskrita Academy. But alas, this was not to be!

"In between the years, he kept me in touch with the progress of his researches which constituted a kind of romance of scholarship and adventurous erudition in the highways and byways of our epic literature. The study of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which has been the *tāraka mantra* of my own humble life brought me in this life the inestimable good fortune of the friendship of two such illustrious men as the late Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri and the late Sri Narayana Aiyer. I must leave it to younger men to study the contribution of these two stalwarts to the popularisation of our epics. But while Sastri was inimitable in certain lines of exposition and presentation, Narayana Aiyer almost specialised in the cruxes of the epic and invariably managed to throw new light on them. He further expanded his sphere of studies to include the world of *Rāmāyaṇa* as shaped by Tamil piety. This caused him to take to the preparation of his essays in Tamil and in a style of *maṇi-pravālam* which, though sometimes quaint, is often a marvel of diglot eloquence. Like Sastri he too began with an ostensible critical and rational approach; but both came under the charm of the epic and confessed their subjection to the art of the *Ādikavi* and the compelling sway of the personality of the hero. Mr. Narayana Aiyer came to see both the woods and the trees..."

V. R.

Mm. A. Chinnaswami Sastri

In the passing away on 11th August, 1956, of Mm. Chinnaswami Sastri, we have lost one of the distinguished Pandits of the old type who had specialised in Mīmāṁsā. The late Sastrigal was one of the foremost Pandit-students of Mm. S. Kuppuswami Sastri and had a successful career as Head of more than one Sanskrit College, at Jaipur, at Tirupati, and at the Banaras Hindu University; he was last in the Post-Graduate Department of the Calcutta University. Among the works he edited or wrote or was associated with are:—

Mīmāṁsākaustubha, 2 Vols. 1924, 1929; *Mīmāṁsānyāyaprakāśa*, 1925; *Āpastamba Gṛhyasūtra*, 1928; *Bṛhatī* of Prabhākara, 1929; *Ujjvalā* of Haradatta, 1932; *Bodhāyana Dharmasūtra*, 1934; *Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa*, 2 parts, 1935, 1936; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, 1937; *Tautātimata Tilaka*, 2 parts, 1939, 1942; *Sandarbhavivaraṇa*, a commentary on

Madhvatantramukhamardana, 1941; *Tantrasiddhāntaratnāvalī* 1944 (all published at Banaras); and *Yajñatattvaprakāśa*, 1954, Madras.

V. R.

PROF. V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

Sri V. A. Ramaswmi Sastri, formerly Professor of Sanskrit at the Annamalai and Travancore Universities passed away on the 19th August 1956 at Poona, where, after retirement, he was working as one of the Assistant Editors of the New Sanskrit Dictionary of the Deccan College Research Institute. He was 59 at the time of his death. The late Ramaswami Sastri was first a product of the Madras Sanskrit College who later graduated as a Sanskrit M. A. and became one of the best-equipped students of Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri. He first served in the Sarasvati Mahal Library, Tanjore, then joined the Sanskrit Department of the Annamalai University and was later appointed Professor of Sanskrit and Honorary Director of the Manuscripts Library, at the Travancore University. He was a specialist in *Mīmāṁsā* and *Sāhitya*, and brought out an edition of the *Tattvabindu* of Vācaspati Miśra with an erudite study and introductory history of the *Mīmāṁsā* school, and a book on Jagannātha Paṇḍita, both of which were published by the Annamalai University. He also edited some works in the *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* and published about sixty research papers. He took active part in the All-India Oriental Conference and was President of the Indian Philosophy Section of its Bombay Session. He was a frequent reviewer of Sastraic publications in the columns of the *Sunday Hindu*. In his demise, the K. S. R. Institute has lost one of its learned Members.

V. R.

K. V. RAMACHANDRAN

The K. S. R. Institute was unfortunate to lose during the year another brilliant member, Sri K. V. Ramachandran. Endowed with keen artistic gifts and rare perception, and himself specially qualified in music and dance, the late Ramachandran made some precious contributions to criticism in the fields of art and letters. His preoccupations with business did not give him time enough to contribute to the literary field as

much as he himself and his friends wanted him to do. He made a special study of Indian art in the Far East, with special reference to Javanese music. The *Triveni* published a number of his illuminating papers on Indian music, dance and art; in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, he published a valuable historical paper on *Maṇimekhalai as a Sea-Goddess* and a paper on *Music and Dance in Kālidāsa*. For a few years, he conducted a Tamil monthly called *Śilpaśrī* devoted to art and letters. His reviews in the literary columns of the *Sunday Hindu* were always fascinating. In his demise, South India has lost a rare type of aesthete.

V. R.

PANDIT M. DORAISWAMI IYENGAR

On December 2, 1956, passed away in Kilpauk, Madras, one of the distinguished Ayurvedic scholars of the South, Pandit M. Doraiswami Iyengar. He was 68 at the time of his demise.

Doraiswami Iyengar was a pupil of Pandit D. Gopalacharlu and was for a time lecturer in the Government School of Indigenous Medicine. He established successful private practice as an Ayurvedic physician and did much for the propagation of Ayurveda by translating Sanskrit texts of Ayurveda into Tamil. A good student of general Sanskrit literature, he translated into Tamil Sanskrit classics like the *Kādambarī* and the works of Kālidāsa, some of which are yet to see the light of day. A capable writer in Sanskrit, he wrote new Sanskrit commentaries on works like the Ayurvedic allegorical play, *Jīvānandana*. He was a nominated member of the Madras University Senate at the time of his demise.

The following are some of the publications of Sri Doraiswami Iyengar: *Śārṅgadhara Saṁhitā*—Tamil Translation, 1915; *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya* of Vāgbhaṭa, Tamil Translation, in 2 vols., 1918, 1920; *Pāñcarātraprakāśa* (Ed. Adyar Library), 1942; *Jīvānandanam* with his own commentary, 1946 (Adyar Library); *Pillai-p-piṇi-vācakam* (Ed.), 1952; all published in Madras.

V. R.

E. K. NATESA SARMA

We are sorry to record here the passing away of E. K. Natesa Sarma, a Member of the Institute. Mr. Sarma who

was Professor of Tamil in the Loyola College, was also a student of Sanskrit and was for a time, one of the Secretaries of the Madras Sanskrit Academy. He was also, for a long time, a Member of the Board of Studies in Tamil in the University of Madras. He wrote a number of books in Tamil which included a metrical rendering of the *Mudrārākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta.

V. R.

MR. CHAMAN LAL BECHAR

We are sorry to hear from Prof. G. H. Bhatt that one of our Members from Baroda, Mr. Chaman Lal Bechar, passed away recently. Mr. Bechar was a student of Sanskrit and an ardent promoter of Sanskrit studies.

V. R.

We also wish to place on record our deep sorrow and the sense of loss sustained by the world of Indology by the demise of the following distinguished scholars:

Sri Madhav Swarup Vats, who was for a long time in the Archaeological Survey of India and retired as Director-General of Archaeology;

Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, versatile scholar of Calcutta, who was at the time of his death Vice-Chancellor of the Visvabharati University and who was the author of *India and China* and several other books; and

Fr. Heras, wellknown historian and founder of the School of Histroical Research in the St. Xavier's College, Bombay.

V. R.

PROFESSOR V. RANGACHARYA

It is with deep regret that we record here the demise of Professor V. Rangacharya at the age of seventytwo on the 6th of December 1956. Born in the Tanjore District he had a distinguished academic career before he joined the Madras Education Service as Lecturer in History. He served in different Government Colleges in the Madras Presidency like the Presidency College, Madras, Government College, Kumbakonam, Government Arts College, Coimbatore, and Victoria College, Palghat, before he became Professor of Indian

History in the Presidency College which place he held for a number of years. After retirement from the Madras Government Service he became Professor of History in the Travancore University and served there for over three years.

Besides being an able teacher he was also a research scholar. He was connected with the *Journal of Indian History* as one of its Associate Editors for a number of years and later as its Editor for some time. He has contributed many learned articles to the pages of different journals. The series of articles he contributed on the Nayaks of Madura to the volumes of the *Indian Antiquary*, 1914 to 1917, are marked by masterly analysis of details. His is the first scientific and reliable account of the dynasty. He prepared a history of 'Pre-Mussalman India' in nine volumes of which unfortunately only two have been published. The most important of his works is the "*Topographical List of the Inscriptions in the Madras Presidency*" collected till 1915. It has been published by the Government of Madras. It contains in all about 20,000 inscriptions and serves as an indispensable book of reference to the students of South Indian History. The Professor delivered a course of lectures on "*South India's relation with the Far-East*" under the Sir Subrahmanya Iyer endowment in the University of Madras.

Unostentatious and simple in his habits he was a deep and erudite scholar with a large fund of information relating to different periods and aspects of Indian History. In his demise Indian historical studies have sustained a great and irreparable loss.

T. V. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

Acharya Vijayavallabhasuri Commemoration Volume, Published by Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya, Gowalia Tank Road, Bombay-26, 1956. Price Rs. 17-8-0.

The volume before us is a notable contribution and is in honour of Ācārya Vijayavallabhasūri, at once a redoutable modern Jaina saint, scholar and reformer. Joining the order at the early age of sixteen and drawing his inspiration from his illustrious Guru, Vijayānandasūri, popularly known as Ātmārāmji, this great soul toiled for sixty-eight long years for the regeneration of Jainism in conformity with the spirit and demand of our age. Uplift through education was his central message. The opposition which he encountered from conservative and orthodox Jainas in the propagation of renascent Jainism, he got over by his perseverance and relentless zeal for the good cause of his faith. The Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay, which has opened its branches in Ahmedabad, Poona and Baroda is a standing monument to the abiding conviction of the saint that the betterment of society lies chiefly in the removal of illiteracy and dissemination of knowledge. "Preaching religion to a Sangha that was socially and psychologically not prepared to receive it" (p. 2) was futile according to him, and economic security, he believed, was the basis for "an understanding and a happy mind which alone can absorb and live up to the great tenets of the Jaina philosophy." Thus the efforts of Ācārya Vijayavallabhasūri constitute a valuable landmark in the cultural history of India.

Quite fitting with the memory of such a conspicuous personality, this volume, gorgeous in content and get-up, has a valuable collection of reminiscences of the great Ācārya and commendable articles from scholars of acknowledged authority. The first two sections, which comprise the bulk of the volume are in Gujarati and Hindi which the reviewer must pass over as he does not know either of these languages. The last section in English covers 175 pages consisting of two notices of the life of the saint and 21 articles. Excepting one, '*A Historical outline of the languages of Western India*',

which seeks to maintain that Gujarati is a 'very important language culturally and politically on the Western coast-line of India' the rest of them relate directly or indirectly to Jainism whose great champion the Ācārya was. A group of articles (*"The Message of the Religion of Ahimsa"*, *"Jainism: its distinctive features and their impact on our composite culture"*, *"The place of Jainism in Indian Thought"*, *"Jainism, a way of Life"*, *"What Jainism offers to the World"*) point out the possibility of unique service which Jainism can render to the world at the present juncture. 'Such an ideal when sufficiently promoted and practised by all individuals will naturally lead to a social development, and there will be no possibility of a clash between Capitalism and Communism' (p. 40). 'This war-torn world, governed by men of ambition and greed will be saved in spite of itself by men of peace who carry in their hearts the instruction of the sages' (*i.e.* Ahimsa) p. 171. 'Can Jainism offer any solution for the above problems?' (*i.e.* social inequalities, economic difficulties, multifarious diseases, over-population and atomic bombs). "Yes. It can and it does offer" provided one follows and applies "its teachings in actual practice as an earnest patient would follow the prescriptions of his doctor." (p. 115). In philosophy, there is *"structural evolutiou and the doctrine of Karma"* which shows, with reference to Sāṅkhya, Nyāya, Jaina and even monistic Vedānta, though differing among themselves, that the material body is not the work of Matter exclusively but includes super-physical principles. There is a specialised and well illustrated study of the iconography of one of the Jain temples at Khajurāho, by a young German scholar; another on *"Some aspects of Jaina Monastic Jurisprudence"* which attempts to show how Jaina monachism, in spite of its tussle with internal and external forces has maintained its orthodoxy in monastic practices; *"The materials used for Jaina inscriptions,"* mostly stone and metal, is the subject of another article. *"A 13th century inscribed Metal-bell from Patan"* in N. Gujarat furnishes interesting evidence of the art of metal-casting in Gujarat for objects used in worship. Stone Jaina images of Tīrthaṅkaras from Maheswar and Nevāsā are studied in another article with a view to show that Digambara Jainism was in a flourishing state in mediaeval period of the Deccan. There is a paper on Ācārya Haribhadra's works on Yoga,

It seeks to show the comprehensiveness of the vision and depth of insight of Haribhadra, a Jaina author of the 8th century A.D. The identification of a unique Jaina sculpture in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, as that of the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara Mallinātha is the subject of another article. Other studies include the life of Jamāli, the author of the first schism in the history of the Jaina church, "*The historical position of Jainism*," "*Fundamental principles of Jainism*," "*Jayā-Group Goddessess*" in Jaina literature, and a study in textual criticism of *Dhūrtākhyāna in the Niśīhacūrṇi*. We congratulate the Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya on the publication of this excellent Commemoration Volume which contains also a number of attractive illustrations.

T. V. MAHALINGAM

ASYA VAMASYA HYMN (THE RIDDLE OF THE UNIVERSE) RGVEDA 1.164, SANSKRIT TEXT WITH THE BHASYAS OF SAYANA AND ATMANANDA AND WITH ENGLISH TRANSLATION AND NOTES by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Professor of Sanskrit, Andhra University, Waltair. Foreword by Dr. Sampurnanand. Ganesh & Co. (Madras) Private Ltd., Madras 17, 1957. Pages xl, 136, 87. Price Rs. 12.

Asya Vāmsya Sūkta containing such wellknown stanzas like *dvā suparṇā-* and *catvāri vāk*, and the declarations '*Ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*, is one of the most important and thought-provoking hymns in the *Ṛgveda*. This philosophical hymn, containing 52 verses, attributed to the seer-poet Dīrghatamas, is written in a symbolic style, full of similes and imageries; and now with the symbolism lost, with the background obliterated, we are not able to understand the full significance of the whole vision of the Universe that the poet had before him. To us it has become a mystery, a puzzle, a riddle. Dr. Raja has rightly called it '*The Riddle of the Universe*'. Various attempts have been made even from ancient times to understand this iddle, but it remains a riddle since we have lost the clue to the right interpretation. Dr. Kunhan Raja has now edited the text with the two important Sanskrit commentaries available, those of Sāyaṇa and Ātmānanda, has given us an English translation along with detailed exegetical study and has made a fresh attempt at finding out the true significance of this

hymn. He has analysed the problems clearly and has given some general directions for finding out the solutions. The detailed Notes in English that he gives are based on a thorough study of the suggestions made by the ancient Indian scholars and modern Orientalists, and are sure to stimulate the interest of all students of Indian culture.

The *Bhāṣya* of Ātmānanda gives a mystic interpretation to the whole hymn and is very interesting, though it cannot be considered to be fully satisfactory in all cases. Ātmānanda does not claim originality for this approach; he says that his explanations are based entirely on the philosophical paraphrase of the hymn found in the *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* where a Yakṣa named Puṣkara teaches Rāma the philosophy contained in the Vedas: *Cf.* P. 99: अस्य भाष्यस्य मूलं विष्णुधर्मोत्तरे यत्र पुष्करनामा यक्षः श्रीरामं प्रति सर्वधर्मानुक्तवान्....तत्र च कतिपयानां सूक्तानां संघातः कल्पश्चोक्तः। तत्रापि अस्यवामीयकल्पो महान् अध्यात्मविषयत्वात्।
He has actually quoted more than fifty versess from that Purāṇa, giving a philosophical meaning to the hymn, though they have not been traced to the printed edition of the Purāṇa. He also says (P. 2) that this philosophical interpretation has been suggested even by Śaunaka, Vedamitra and the authors of *Bṛhaddevatā* and the *Anukramaṇī*, though later commentators like Skandasvāmin, Udgītha and Bhāskara have explained it only from the ritualistic and devotional points of view. The present edition of this *Bhāṣya* is based on an Adyar Library transcript of a manuscript in the India Office Library, and an old edition from Lahore.

Dr. C. Kunhan Raja is well-known for his Vedic studies, and editions of some rare and important pre-Sāyaṇa commentaries on the Vedas. In editing this philosophical hymn with two Sanskrit commentaries, English translation and detailed exegetic notes, Dr. Raja's aim is to stress the fact that the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and the ritualism of the earlier phase of the Vedas formed a single harmonious unit, and that the Upaniṣads simply interpret one side of this culture with the background of ritualism. He says that "the Upaniṣads are attempts to preserve and interpret the Vedic thoughts, and not to break away from the Vedic ritualism." Many of the modern Orientalists are prone to assign all Vedic hymns containing any philosophical idea to relatively later

times; Dr. Raja criticises such an approach, and shows that the *Asya Vāmasya* hymn belongs to the early Vedic texts themselves. Dīrghatamas, the author of this hymn, belongs to a group of really ancient poets and has to his credit 25 hymns in the first *Maṇḍala* of the Ṛgveda; even from the stylistic point of view this hymn cannot be relegated to a later period. Regarding the philosophical content of the hymn, Dr. Raja says that it is not merely some anticipations of philosophy that we find here, but "a scanty remnant from an earlier date of an immense store of philosophy, grand, sublime, profound, clear and definite."

Messrs Ganesh & Co., whose services to the cause of publishing Tantric texts is well-known, must be congratulated on this publication.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA

FRANCE-ASIE: PRESENCE DU CAMBODGE (*Cambodia Special Volume*) Nos. 114-115, Nov.-Dec. 1955, pp. 315-560, 18 plates, Saigon. Ed. Rene de Berval.

This special volume of the *France-Asie*, the popular French monthly from Saigon, is entirely devoted to Cambodia. Divided into ten sections, it carries studies on several aspects of Cambodia, Arts, Language and Literature, Religion, History, Geography, Ethnography, Folklore etc., contributed by standard writers. The volume commences with geographical and historical accounts of the country followed by a chronological and descriptive table of the kings of the land from 550 A.D. todate. Translations of the oath of allegiance taken by the officers of Sūryavarman I (1011 A.D.) and extracts from inscriptions from Ankor celebrating the glory of Jayavarman VII (12th cent.) who built the temple, and from Say-Fong, of the same king, on the maintenance of hospitals, and of a traditional account of the foundation of Phenom Penh (15th cent.) are valuable to the students of history as well as of culture.

Classical Cambodian art and sculpture form the theme of two articles, 'Ankor—the manifestation of the universe' by Pierre Grison, and 'The symbolism of Hindu and Khmer temples' by Henri Marchal. Modern Cambodian art is also represented in this section. An account of ethnographical

studies in Cambodia is given by Poree-Maspero. Two other articles deal with military ceremonies and dances at the advent of the New year.

In the section on Religion, Francois Martini has two articles on 'Buddhist priests' and the 'Organisation of the Buddhist clergy' which together give a general picture of the religious orders in Cambodia. In a separate section, besides general accounts of Cambodian language and literature, both ancient and modern, certain aspects of the literature have also been specially studied. Some of the other interesting pieces in the volume are short studies on Cambodian dietetics, forest professions and games and pastimes.

The volume also carries at the end a good bibliography of books and studies on the history and culture of Cambodia.

K. V. Sarma

France-Asie: Presence Du Royaume Laos, (*Laos Special Volume*) Nos. 118-119, March-April, 1956. pp. 703-1154, 24 plates, 38 drawings and 2 maps. Saigon, Ed. Rene de Berval.

A companion volume to its Cambodia number, this special volume of the *France-Asie*, of about 500 pages divided into 13 sections, is devoted to studies on Laos, 'the country of the thousand elephants and the white umbrella'. The first two sections comprise studies on the geography and history of the land followed by a chronological table of dates and events from about 1300 A.D. to modern times.

The section on Arts includes studies on Laotian decorative art, sculptured caves in Vientiane, Laotian music and a synoptic table giving the characteristics of the statues of the Buddha of different periods and localities. In Laos, even as in India, the almanac plays an important role in the social and religious life of the people, and a detailed study of the Laotian calendar given in the volume is specially informative and will enable a comparative study with the Indian calendar. The Ethnography section contains studies on several social and religious ceremonies connected with birth, marriage, death, harvest etc. Articles on pastimes and dietetics are also included herein.

The history, development and practice of Buddhism in Laos and the organisation of the Buddhist clergy are treated in the section on religion, which contains besides accounts of

certain religious observances. A study on Laotian scripts by Louis Finot is reproduced in the section on language and literature, which contains also well-written studies on Laotian language, literature and poetry. A few extracts from Laotian classics and annals, translated here give an insight into the original literature of the land. In the folklore section a number of Laotian proverbs have been collected and translated, besides some fables. The volume is profusely illustrated with art-plates and drawings.

The volume carries also a useful bibliography of books and articles bearing on the history and culture of Laos.

K. V. SARMA

NOTABLE HOROSCOPES By B. V. Raman. Raman Publications, Bangalore, 1956. Pp. xvi, 416. Rs. 7-8-0.

The *Notable Horoscopes* by B. V. Raman of the *Astrological Magazine* fills a great vacuum in the astrological sphere by dealing with various types of horoscopes of notable astrological interest. This treatise is quite comprehensive and compelling in that it proves a great spur in astrological activity on the part of even sceptics who generally challenge the truths of astrology. These sceptics or scoffers are generally among those who seek the astrologer's help and guidance secretly as they cannot pursue the secret subject in the real spirit of a humble pupil of the great sages of the past from whom the mystic subject of astrology has been handed down to posterity. The author in this work has made it an easy subject to the lovers and readers of astrological works to understand and apply the logic of his arguments by oft-repeated rules and principles pledged to a vindication of the scientific status of astrology. Many useful configurations of planets with their possible trends for the health, prosperity, financial windfalls and lastly the span of life that one may be allotted to, are some of the saliant features of this treatise.

P. V. RAO

ASTROLOGY AND MODERN THOUGHT By B. V. Raman. Raman Publications, Bangalore, 1956. Pp. ii, 116.

In this work the author explains how to link up traditional philosophy with modern scientific thought. But these

two are like two poles asunder and therefore it is not exactly correct to say that we can reduce metaphysical science to terms of natural philosophy. All the same, the author has tried his best to drive home his views to the reader's mind by interesting examples of planetary influences on human beings so that every modern thinker will be stimulated to evince greater and greater interest in the investigation of astrological truths adumbrated in this treatise.

P. V. RAO

UNADI KOSA of Mahādeva Vedāntin Edited with the Uṇādi Sūtras and full Glossorial Index by Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja, with a Foreword by Dr. V. Raghavan. Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 21. 1956, Pp. 5, xvi, 262. Rs. 10.

The school of Śākaṭāyana in Sanskrit grammar holds that every Sanskrit word, however obscure it might seem to be, is derivable from a root by the addition of suffixes. The *Uṇādi Sūtras*, so called after the first suffix *'uṇ'*, present analytically the various suffixes and the basic roots pertaining to each, which together go to build up the words of obscure derivation. The work reviewed here, *Uṇādi Kośa* of Mahādeva Vedāntin, is a metrical lexicon of the *Uṇādi* words, taken in their order, with their different meanings. The *Uṇadī Sūtras* have come down to us in two recensions, one in ten sections (*Daśapādī*) and the other in five sections (*Pañcapādī*); our author follows the former. In the present edition the *sūtras* are added in their appropriate places in between the lines.

In the Introduction the editor gives an account of the author and his works, and discusses the variant readings and meanings adopted by Mahādeva as compared with other writers on the *Uṇādis*. He has also appended to the edition a useful Glossorial Index of all the words in the *Kośa* with an indication of their derivation and meanings in English for easy reference.

The present edition has been issued by the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University as part of the a programme of critical editions of the available works on the *Uṇādis*, which would help a detailed study of this important subject.

K. V. SARMA

BULLETIN SIGNALETIQUE: Quarterly published by the Centre for Documentation of the National Centre for Scientific Research, Ministry of National Education, Paris, VOL. X (1956), Pp. 787.

The value of classified bibliographies for specialisation and research, and even for general studies, is well recognised today, and standard bibliographical periodicals like the one reviewed here need no special recommendation. The *Bulletin Signaletique* (originally *Bulletin Analytique*), published by the National Centre for Scientific Research, Paris, is a comprehensive bibliography of current literature, both books and articles, covering Philosophy, the Humanities and the Sciences. Published four times a year, each issue carries on the average 4,000 classified entries, each entry being followed by short descriptions. Indology is included under Philosophy and Linguistics. It has however to be observed that literature published in India is far from being adequately represented, possibly due to non-availabitity of reference material. It is desirable therefore that the authorities responsible for this bibliographical periodical take steps to augment their sources of information about India, and also Indian publishers and editors send them uptodate information about their publications.

K. V. S.

NAISADHA CARITA OF SRIHARSA. By Prof. K. K. Handiqui, Vice-Chancellor, Gauhati University. Published by the Deccan College Research Institute, Poona 6. 1956. Rs. 18.

From Bhāravi onwards, the Mahākāvya in Sanskrit became increasingly the work of a learned scholar and the value of a Mahākāvya as a repository of varied information pertaining to the several branches of literature and social and cultural material reaches its maximum in the *Naiṣadha Carita,* not only one of the longest poems in Sanskrit but described truly by students of the work down the ages as '*vidvadauṣadham*'. It was a most useful idea therefore to produce a study of the *Naiṣadha Carita,* and Prof. K. K. Handiqui gave us his work on this poem in 1934. The work of Prof. Handiqui was complete with a Translation of the difficult text of Śrīharṣa, an Introduction to the Commentators,

detailed notes embodying extracts from unpublished commentaries, appendices of critical material comprising elucidations and compressed monographs on the allusions to the tenets of the different philosophical systems and religious sects, and a vocabulary giving the rarer words with detailed lexicographical notes. Handiqui's study has been in wide and constant use, like Śrīharṣa's poem itself, and there has been a demand for copies of his work. We are therefore much indebted to the Professor for undertaking the second revised edition of the work despite his heavy duties as Vice-Chancellor and indifferent health.

In the present edition, the translation has been revised, and more notes and appendices have been added, making the edition all the more valuable.

The book has been excellently printed by Messrs G. S. Press, Madras.

V. R.

THE EARLIEST VINAYA AND THE BEGINNING OF BUDDHIST LITERATURE. By E. Frauwallner, Serie Orientale Roma. IsMEO., Rome. 1956. Pp. 218.

Prof. Frauwallner, the chief Sanskritist now in Austria, has specialised in the history of the Indian philosophical systems and two volumes of his history of Indian Philosophy have already been published. In a more detailed manner, Frauwallner has examined Buddhistic works, and we have now from him a very important study of the Vinaya texts so as to throw light on the growth of early Buddhist literature.

The Vinaya, the first corpus of Buddhistic writings, is known at least in six schools, Śākhās if we may use an analogical designation from Vedic literature,—Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahīśāsaka, Pali of Ceylon, Mūlasarvāstivādin and Mahāsāṅghika; those other than the Pāli are preserved in the Chinese and Tibetan translations and also in fragments of Sanskrit originals discovered in Gilgit. A close examination of the texts in these recensions, discloses similarity and points to the growth of these from a common nucleus which it is the purpose of Frauwallner to arrive at in this analysis. The analysis reveals many interesting data bearing on the growth of early Buddhistic texts in the communities of Buddhists who, in the course of their missionary work, spread

from Indian centres to outlying and Trans-Indian regions. Naturally the discussion takes the author to an inquiry into the origin and personnel of these missions. The Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins, the Dharmaguptakas, the Mahīsāsakas and the Pāli go to Asoka's missionaries who took a nucleus-text of about 250 B. C. from Vaiśāli. The nucleus of the Mūla-sarvāstivādins of Kashmir and Gandhāra point to Mathura as the source. The Pāli (Skandhaka) and the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya point to a pre-Asokan nucleus of the 4th century B. C. which was steadily enlarged, much on the model of the Vedic Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣadic texts, palpable parallels with which could not be missed. Monastic formulae of a brief form, easy for memorising and oral transmission, which were handed down were taken up and enlarged with illustrative episodes from the Buddha's life, so that the whole thing took eventually the form of a biography of the Buddha. In tracing this growth, one finds that the Church history as obtaining in the Pāli or other sources suffers in its historical value; as only the basic formulae were more or less fixed and remembered and orally transmitted, and the expounders added or changed, the differences arose.

The study includes detailed analyses of the different Vinaya texts. The work, published by Prof. Tucci through the IsMEO, Rome, forms a stimulating study and though itself deriving from some of the brilliant suggestions of Sylvain Levi, it opens up, in its turn, very fruitful and important lines of enquiry into the origin and growth of early Buddhistic writings.

V. R.

SANTANAGOPALA PRABANDHA OF ASVATI TIRUNAL RAMAVARMA YUVARAJA OF TRAVANCORE, WITH THE BHAKTAPRIYA COMMENTARY by P. Govindaru Namputirippad, Tarananallur Netumpalli Mana, Irinjalakkuda (Trichur). 1954. Pp. 144. Price not indicated.

Prabandhas or short *Campū kāvyas* form an important section of Sanskrit literature in Kerala. They are used by the Cākyārs—professional actors of Sanskrit plays in Kerala—as basic texts for *Kūttu* or the popular exposition of Purāṇic stories. Melpputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, the great scholar-poet of Kerala, wrote several such *Prabandhas* for the

use of his friend Iravi Cākyār (Ravinartaka) of Kuṭṭañceri; these works have inspired later writers to compose other works on the same model. Among such later *Prabandhas* the *Santānagopāla* of Aśvati Tirunāl Rāmavarma Yuvarāja of Travancore occupies an important place. Prince Rāmavarma who flourished from 1755 to 1795 A. D. was the nephew of Kārttika Tirunāl Mahārāja of Travancore (who ruled from 1758 to 1798) and the son of Ravivarma Koil Tampurān of Kilimānūr, the famous author of the Kathakali work *Kaṁsavadham*. Rāmavarma has written several works both in Malayalam and in Sanskrit; among his Sanskrit works are the *Rukmiṇīpariṇaya Nāṭaka*, *Śṛṅgārasudhākara Bhāṇa* and the *Campūs Santānagopāla* and *Kārtavīryavijaya*.

The *Santānagopāla Prabandha* which is now published in Devanāgari script for the first time deals with the story of Arjuna promising a Brahman to protect his children, and with the help of Kṛṣṇa going to the abode of Viṣṇu and bringing back the lost sons of the Brahman. This theme is very popular in Kerala, the *Santānagopālam Pāna* by Pūntānam Nambūtiri being a classical work in Malayalam literature. Aśvati Tirunāl Yuvarāja is a fine scholar and his style is chaste and dignified. The commentary on the work is by Tarananallūr Neṭumpalli Govindaru Nampūtiripād, a well-known scholar who has already to his credit an elaborate and exhaustive commentary on the *Āśaucadīpaka* of Mahiṣamaṅgalam Nampūtiri, and a Stotra work *Saṅgameśa Stotra* on the deity of the temple at Irinjalakkuda. The commentary is thorough and exhaustive, discussing the derivations and implications of each word and quoting profusely from authoritative sources.

K. K. R.

OUR HERITAGE. Bulletin of the Department of Post Graduate Training and Research, Sanskrit College, Calcutta. Rs. 5. or 8 sh. 3 d.

The Sanskrit College, Calcutta, was started as early as 1824; recently the Government of Bengal appointed a special committee to examine the position of the traditional Tols or Pathasalas. One of the results of the recommendations of this Committee was the addition of a Research Department to this Sanskrit College in which modern University Research scholars could work and make their contributions. There is

no doubt of the possibility of a great deal of collaboration between traditional Pandits and modern scholars under such a set-up, and in an institution like the Calcutta Sanskrit College where there is an excellent collection of Sanskrit manuscripts, one could expect an appreciable flow of work. However, it all depends on the extent of printing and other facilities which the Government extends to the new Department.

The idea to issue a Bulletin from this Depatment is to be welcomed. Such a journal can clear articles and shorter texts and studies, from time to time, while editions of texts and theses and monographs could be separately issued.

In the two issues of the *Our Heritage* now before us, we have a number of contributions from the Research Professors of the Government Sanskrit College, in the Departments of Veda, Purāṇa and Dharma, Sāhitya and Darśana. The opening paper in the first part is a survey of sects in the Mahābhārata, Saura, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava, by Dr. S. K. De. Kalidas Bhattacarya compares the Indian and western concept of causation. Śaiva Purāṇa and its textual problems engage the attention of R. C. Hazra who has made many specialised studies in Puranic literature. A. K. R. Chaudhuri has a paper relating to Advaita and G. Bhattacharya and Pandits Chinnaswami Sastri and Yogendranatha Tarka-Vedanta Tirtha, three relating to Mīmāṁsā. There is a paper on the Sarvāstivāda school of Buddhism by Anantakumar Bhattacharya. In the second number, Durgamohan Bhattacharya draws attention to the value of Halāyudha's Brāhmaṇasarvasva as a Vedic gloss of the pre-Sāyaṇa times. Dr. S. K. De deals with the much-discussed question of a Nāṭya Śāstra text called Ādi-Bharata *vis-a-vis* a fragmentary manuscript of a late work of that name in the B. O. R. I. Regarding this B. O. R. I. manuscript, I may draw the attention of Prof. De to my own brief account of it and the Nāṭya-Sarvasvadīpikā *alias* Ādi-Bharata in my paper on 'Later Sangita Literature' in Vol. IV (1933) of the *Journal of the Music Academy, Madras,* p. 82. R. C. Hazra examines in detail the manuscripts of the work called Vahnipurāṇa and concludes that it represents the genuine Agnipurāṇa. The puranic text known as Dharma-purāṇa is shown by Asoke Chatterji to have been written in Assam soon after the Muslim invasion there. Sri Yogendranath Tarka-Vedanta Tirtha discusses Bhāskara's Brahmapariṇāmavāda. There

are also papers by research students and scholars and of non-English papers, English summaries are furnished.

We wish *Our Heritage* a successful career and hope its issues will come out more quickly and regularly.

V. R.

BUDDHISM AND DEVOTION: A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY. By Acharya Bhikkhu Buddharakhita. Re. 1.

GAUTAMA BUDDHA THE INCOMPARABLE PHYSICIAN. By Major Gen. S. L. Bhatia. Re. 1.

MAHAVIRA AND HIS PHILOSOPHY OF LOVE. By Dr. A. N. Upadhye. Re. 1.

Publishers: The Indian Institute of Culture, North Public Square Road, Bangalore-4.

These three pamphlets reproduce lectures delivered at the Indian Institute of Culture, Bangalore, last year, the first two with special reference to the Buddha Jayanti celebrated all over the country. In the first, Buddharakhita expatiates on the emotional side of Buddhistic sādhana which is sometimes denied to that school or is associated with its Mahayanic phase only. Devotion in Buddhism, the author says, relates to the three *Ratnas*, the Buddha, His Order and His Teachings. Whether in Buddhism, Hinduism or Christianity, devotion derives its life and significance with reference to a Personality which is sought and adored as the object of attainment or guidance and help, and the effort of the author here to distinguish Buddhistic Bhakti as something different or unique appears difficult to grasp.

Major Gen. Bhatia takes the caption of his paper from the Buddha's own words and sets forth the life and doings of the Buddha with special reference to the ministrations He did to the sickly and the ailing. The contribution of later Buddhist writers to the science of Ayurveda and the likely influence of Ayurveda on Greek medicine are touched upon. Summarising the contribution of the Buddhistic movement to ancient medicine, the author draws attention to the ethical basis given to treatment and nursing, the method of direct observation and study of human problems and the equal emphasis laid on physical and psychological cure.

The third pamphlet deals with a contemporary of the Buddha and the promulgator of the sister faith of Jainism.

Dr. A. N. Upadhye gives here a bird's eye view of Mahāvīra, his antecedents, the historical and cultural importance of Vaiśāli, the inter-relation of Buddhism and Jainism and the main contributions of Jainism and Jains to Indian culture. He pleads for a more detailed comparative study of Buddhism and Jainism. Attention is also drawn to the Syādvāda of Jainism, which, apart from its metaphysical value, has a broader psychological and cultural significance.

V. R.

INDIA MUVESZETE. Baktay Ervin. Budapest.
KINA MUVESZETE. Miklos Pal. Budapest.

In the first pamphlet are given reproductions with introduction and notes some of the Indian antiquities in the Budapest Museum of Eastern Asiatic Arts. These antiquities comprise specimens relating to the art of the Indus valley, Gāndhāra, Mathura, Rajaputna, Bihar, Bengal, Orissa, and Nepal; there are some paintings and jewellery included here. Baktay Ervin who is charge of this section and has written the notes here has many works on India to his credit and was in India quite recently.

The second pamphlet relates to an exhibition of Chinese art in the same museum. The specimens figured here include a Mañjuśrī Bronze.

V. R.

THE PATH OF THE BUDDHA. Edited by Kenneth Morgan. Ronald Press Co., New York. 1956. $ 5.00.

Kenneth Morgan, Colgate University, U. S., came out to India in 1952 under the American foundation called the National Council on Religion in Higher Education to arrange for expositions of non-Christian religions written by those who profess them so that students in the West, particularly America, might have in their hands some authentic accounts of these religions. Prof. Morgan produced in 1953 the *Religion of the Hindus* written by Hindu scholars. He followed this up with an effort to bring out in 1956,—when the 2500th anniversary of the Buddha was celebrated all over South-East Asia,—a companion volume on Buddhism. The result is the present volume in about 450 pages covering the

whole world of Buddhism, spatially as well as from the point of view of its forms and schools. The task of Prof. Morgan in this book has been more strenuous as he had to give here place to other countries besides India, *viz.*, Ceylon, Burma, Tibet, China, Korea, Japan, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, and as he had to get some of the contributions translated into English. Except in the case of China, the chapters dealing with the major countries have been written by representatives of those countries themselves. Compared to the earlier book, the present one is full of details and also, the account is, by reason of the wider provenance of the religion, mixed up with the history of the spread of the faith over those countries. A further difference is that in some chapters there is comparative evaluation particularly with reference to Hinduism and, obviously because of the missionary character of Buddhism, the question of the place and future of the religion are also touched upon.

The book opens appropriately with a comprehensive survey of the origin and expansion of Buddhism by a representative from the native home of Buddhism. In the succeeding two chapters, the Hīnayāna school is dealt with as practised in the Theravāda countries of S. E. Asia. Four further chapters are devoted to Mahāyāna Buddhism as it arose and developed in the North-West of India and spread to Central Asia, China, Korea, Japan and Tibet. While dealing with the faith as current in each country, the different sects are also taken into account; in some places, Buddhism has spread as a layer over the older faith and survivals and admixtures of earlier native elements and growth of local pecularities have given a complexion to the religion in each country. Even words like *yāna* and central doctrines like the *pratīya-samutpāda* had gathered different, though semantically explainable, connotations in the different lands and schools. Therefore a reader will find the last chapter useful and necessary because it co-ordinates all the accounts and sums up the unity underlying all this diversity.

Although there are numerous books on Buddhism, and the recent 2500th Buddha Jayanti added a good number to the existing literature, the present endeavour of Prof. Morgan fulfils a distinct purpose and fills a void in so far as this is the most compendious survey of Buddhism as prevalent in all its countries. It should serve as a ready reference book,

as notes are also included on places of Buddhistic pilgrimage. The Editor is to be congratulated on this achievement.

The book has a useful map of the Buddhistic world, bibliography, glossary of terms and index.

V. R.

KHALJI KALEEN BHARAT: HISTORY OF THE KHALJIS (1290-1320). By Dr. S. Athar Abbas Rizvi. Source Book of Medieval Indian History in Hindi, Vol. III, Aligarh University, 1956. Pp. 230, 10, 15. Rs. 8.

For a true and full history of India, a correct picture of the diverse currents and cross-currents is necessary. Unfortunately neither have the sources been abundant, nor have the available ones fully or properly utilised. Racial prejudices and reservations of the historians have also contributed to some extent in this state of affairs. Much real light can be thrown on India's historic personages and the events of her history if the writings of contemporary authors could be brought out. The book under review is an endeavour in this direction. Dr. Rizvi has brought out true Hindi translations of the Persian historical works of the period 1290 to 1320 which depict contemporary India under Khalji rule. The originals are by Ziauddin Barni, Amir Khusro, Asami, Ibn Batuta, Yahya, Farishta and Abdulla who all lived near about this period. Elliot and Dowson have already translated into English some contemporary historical literature of this period, but this suffers to some extent from their lack of knowledge of Persian and other reasons. A good scholar in Persian and Hindi, besides Indian history, Dr. Rizvi has brought to bear his knowledge upon his work and has given us in the present volume lucid Hindi translations of eleven contemporary historical narratives, which together give a full picture of the period under study.

The work being in Hindi comes as a very timely publication as Hindi is gradually becoming the medium of instruction for higher studies especially in Hindi areas. The Aligarh University which published the book and Dr. Rizvi deserve to be congratulated in their commendable endeavour. We await the further volumes of this nature which are in preparation.

S. SHAKAR RAJU NAIDU

ETHNOLOGICAL FIELD-RESEARCH IN CHITRAL, SIKKIM AND ASSAM. By Halfdan Siiger. Copenhagen, 1956, pp. 66.

This is a brief preliminary report from the work done by the third Danish Expedition to Central Asia in 1947. The people to be first investigated were the Kalash or Black Kafirs of Chitral who speak an Indo-Aryan dialect on which Prof. Morgenstierne of Oslo has done linguistic and literary investigations. The present expedition carried out investigations in their social life, religion, shrines, festivals, mythology, etc. The second venue of researeh visited by the team was Sikkim where the Lepchas were studied; their religion is an offshoot of pre-Lamaite Central Asian Shamanism. In Tibetan culture, special study was made of the dancing pilgrims who, in the course of their journey on foot to Buddhistic shrines in India, go in a troupe doing dances on the way. The last tribe to be studied were the Boro of Assam. In all the places, cultural material was registered and acquired; the report short as it is lists the data registered and the materials, products, manuscripts, bronzes, etc., acquired at the respective places.

It is hoped that the enterprise of such foreign countries in the field of archaeological investigations will be followed by the Indian Government and its Archaeological Department.

V. R.

KALIDASA-LEXICON, Vol. I. Basic Text of the Works, Part I: Abhijñāna Śākuntala. A. Scharpe. University of Ghent, 1954. De Tempel, Tempelhof 37, Brugge, Belgium.

Elsewhere I have given an account of the most interesting and valuable work, the *Kālidāsa-Lexicon*, which Dr. Scharpe, Professor of Sanskrit at both the Universities of Ghent in Belgium and of Amsterdam in Holland, has undertaken. As the basis of his lexicon of words in Kālidāsa (Part II) Prof. Scharpe is bringing out as Part I, an edition of the texts of the plays and poems of the poet. In these editions, no fresh manuscript material is used nor an attempt made to reconstruct a critical text; but a *composite* text is offered using the chief recensions, *e.g.*, here in the *Śākuntala* the Devanagari and Bengali recensions, with citations of readings from other recensions and citations of the work in Alaṅkāra Śāstra. The

method adopted is to indicate the variants by brackets in the body of the running text itself. The additional variants are placed at the end of the book.

We wish Prof. Scharpe all success in his undertaking. The editions, it may be noted, are in the Roman script; the typography and critical indications, brackets, numbering, etc., are all excellent.

V. R.

BHASKARI Vol. III. An English Translation of the Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī in the light of Bhāskarī with an outline of the History of Śaiva Philosophy. Dr. Kanti Chandra Pandey. The Princess of Wales Sarasvati Bhavan Texts, 84. Superintendent, Printing and Stationery, Lucknow, U. P. Rs. 7-15-0.

Scholars devoting themselves to the study of Śaivism cannot be said to be many and among Śaiva schools, the Pratyabhijñā is almost a neglected field; it is to the credit of Dr. K. C. Pandey of the Sanskrit Department of the Lucknow University that he has consistently engaged himself in making available more and more materials for the study of this significant development of Indian thought.

The present publication gives in its main part an English translation of one of the most important texts of Kashmir Saivism, the Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Utpaladeva with the vivṛti-commentary of Abhinavagupta, the greatest commentator and propagator of that school. This text in English is just half of the book; the other half is taken up by a history of Śaiva philosophy in about two hundred pages, almost a thesis which might as well have been separately printed. The making up of the book in this manner is not convenient for scholars who would lock up for accounts of Śaivism and miss such a lengthy account dovetailed into a translation which itself is obscured under the main title *Bhāskarī*.

Dr. Pandey has done a distinct service to students of Kashmir Śaivism in offering this English translation of Utpaladeva's Īśvarapratyabhijñā and its gloss by Abhinavagupta. In his translation, the writer follows the Bhāskarī, the commentary of Bhāskarakaṇṭha on Abhinavagupta's Vivṛti; this super-gloss, a manuscript of which Dr. Pandey

discovered in Kashmir in 1931 and which he has already edited, is a great help in understanding the difficult scholium of Abhinavagupta.

The introductory account of Śaivism falls into two parts, a historical survey and an exposition of the philosophical position. In view of the paucity of connected accounts of such an important part of Hindu religion as Śaivism, students will welcome the effort of Dr. Pandey in this survey of the schools of Śaivism and the doctrinal differences among these schools. After a very brief reference to the antiquity of Śaivism as borne out by possible evidences of Mohenjo-daro culture, the writer touches, both in the historical and the philosophical part, on Śaivism in the Vedas; one wishes he had devoted greater attention to the ample material in the Vedas bearing on Śaivism which some contend, on one-sided reasoning, as extra-Vedic. The reviewer is glad to note that the writer who had once contended that *'Śruti'* in Pratyabhijñā means the Āgamas and not the Vedas has pointed out here that standard Pratyabhijñā writers do quote Vedas and their texts as authorities.

Dr. Pandey classifies Śaivism into eight schools but two included by him, the Nandikeśvara and Raseśvara schools, are minor phases. The main Śaiva schools adopt the different standpoints of monism and the dualism and the middling ones of identity-cum-difference of more than one shade,—the Pratyabhijñā, the Kashmirian dualistic school, the Siddhānta, the Pāśupata and the Viśiṣṭādvaitic varieties of Śrīkaṇṭha and the Vīraśaivas.

There is a useful appendix of Sanskrit extracts, as also an Index. Those interested in Śaivism will be looking forward eagerly to the full history of Śaiva philosophy which, the writer promises, will follow in due course.

V. R.

VISVESVARA SMRTI OR ĀRYAVIDHANA. By Pt. Mm. Sāhityācārya Visvesvarnath Reu, Jodhpur. Pūrvārdha. Published by Govardhanlal Kabra, Kuchaman ki Haveli, Jodhpur. Rs. 2.

The author of this work is a wellknown Pandit and Research scholar who was for long the Superintendent of the Archaeological Department of Jodhpur and has written also

on the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The present literary effort of his is in a different line. The *Viśveśvara Smṛti* of his, named after himself, is a modern adaptation of Manu, retaining him generally but introducing wherever necessary modern ideas, *e.g.*, the appearance of the world according to science, the changes that have been made in Hindu law by the modern courts (in British days), etc. In the preface and introductory verses, the author explains by an analysis of the Smṛti texts that such adaptations due to historical causes and new developments in knowledge had been made in the past. While he has taken into consideration all new facts, he has conserved the ideas in Manu as much as possible; his aim, as he states, has been to save as much as possible of Mānava Dharma at the present juncture when owing to western impact, there is the danger of everything going away. The author has no doubt bestowed much thought on the questions he has tackled here. The text is written Anuṣṭubh verses and furnished with a Hindi gloss.

The effort of the author reminds one of the *Mānava Dharma Sāra* by Bhagavan Das who contributes a foreword to this work.

V. R.

ANYOKTISTABAKA OF VAMSIDHARA. Edited by Messrs J. T. Parikh and R. G. Asti. Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan Studies No. 4. Sarvajanik Education Society, Surat. Rs. 2.

After the cessation of the *Kāvyamālā Gucchakas*, a medium of publication which could easily bring out specimens from the enormous mass of *khaṇḍa-kāvyas* has not been available; scholars have been editing khaṇḍa-kāvyas in Bulletins of Manuscripts Libraries or as appendices in journals, and sometimes independently also, adding to them long introductory studies. The work under review comes under the last class, and it has been edited by Prof. J. T. Parikh and R. G. Asti of the M. B. T. College, Surat, and published under the auspices of the Chunilal Gandhi Vidyabhavan, a newly organised Research centre at Surat.

It is interesting to know that this new Institute of advanced studies has made a collection of manuscripts and that the work now issued is based on the manuscript material

in this collection. The work is a century of simple *Anyāpadeśa verses,* some of which are indeed striking.

There is a lengthy study in the Introduction on the history and evolution of the idea of *Anyāpadeśa* in Alankāra Śāstra. The attention of the editors may be drawn to the account of *Anyāpadeśa* literature with special reference to Bhallaṭa that the present reviewer gave in the first number of the Annals of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.

V. R.

ISOPALAMBHAH. By Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra. National Publishing House, New Delhi. Re. 1.

The world of research scholars hides indeed many an unsuspected poet. Dr. B. Ch. Chhabra, formerly Government Epigraphist, and now Dy. Director-General of Archaeology, New Delhi, writes his Sanskrit poems with ease and correctness. The *Īśopālambhaḥ* which is one of the few from among his Sanskrit writings to be published is a hymn on Śiva in the *nindā-stuti* style familiar to South Indian devotional poetry and song. The gift for wit and fancy, making clever use of easy śleṣas, is clear in some of the vakroktis here, *e. g.*, verses 3, 4, 6, 46, 54, 57, 90. We extend our best wishes to Dr. Chhabra for the success of his poetic efforts.

V. R.

CULTURAL FREEDOM IN ASIA. Charles E. Tuttle Co. of Rutland, Vermont & Tokyo, Japan. Price in Japan y. 360.

Against the threat of Communism which does not come in the garb of an invading army but with the slogans of liberation, the countries of Asia are finding it difficult today to withstand its force. At any rate some of the recently freedom-won countries are not able to escape the new form of State control in the shape of governmental and administrative intervention too often into the various spheres of life resulting in limiting, if not curtailing the precious freedom, so much coveted. Indeed, the newly-gained freedom is running the risk of being snatched away in the wake of the many fissiperous influences born of internal dissensions—linguistic, regional, religious and other types of dividing pressures. So it was, that the intellectuals of Asia—at any rate the leading

members of that class—felt the need to convene a Conference in which delegates from various parts of Asia could participate in order to discuss problems such as recovery of freedom amidst so many contending ideologies, reconstruction of the economic basis, developing indigent resources, stabilization of political independence etc.

The Conference met in the third week of February of the year 1955, at Rangoon, and among those names of the delegates a few like Dr. Kotaro Tanaka, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Japan, Jayaprakash Narain, Lin Yutang, Dr. Conrado Benitz require mention, for their freshness of outlook brought to bear on the topics which were mooted as well as expatiated upon. The volume under review is not exactly a report of the proceedings of the Conference but one based on the proceedings, and hence we find more a selection here of the speeches and deliberations recorded.

Some of the papers read at the session, which lasted for four days consecutively, deserve a close perusal and study in order to enable the readers have a vision of what contemporary intellectuals the world over—at any rate a hemisphere—have been at pains to discover to thinking groups of men and women, the way to lasting peace through the preservation of freedom at all cost. Thus we find even in the opening address of the Mayor of Rangoon the sentiments: 'Culture is the best means of solving these problems, and I feel the men of culture are best fitted for the task. For unlike politicians, they deal in humanity. They are concerned with the basic human experience.' Again in some of the later pages we come across ideas which really stimulate us for more and more absorption of similar thoughts. Minoo Masani gives in a nutshell what strikes us as very important in the present context of freedom-won countries. 'Culture to the totalitarians is a mere means to a political end already determined by the dictators. In the context of the twentieth century, freedom of expression is the essence of culture'. Indeed, there can be no two opinions on it. Salutary maxims like 'Science must be a means to an end; it must not become our master', referred to in another speech printed here may go a long way to dispel minds suffering from a basic confusion that science alone can take us where religion or philosophy must fail. Again the frequent slogan of higher standards of living made so much of by the Welfare States is

sobered down by the timely warning: 'A higher standard of living must not become our new God.'

The entire volume is divided into sections under sub-heads and the reader is provided with a conspectus of all the problems facing the countries of Asia owing to the need today for a whole continent surviving every attempt at annihilation due to the discovery of terrible weapons like the Hydrogen Bomb. This is more a collection of the main currents of thought prevailing among the Asians for meeting the onset of Communism and Totalitarianism. No doubt we are regaled here and there with fresh accounts of the conditions existing in Japan, China and the Phillipines—to take three important countries affected by Western ideas in certain aspects of life.

Democracy, if it should succeed in its proper role of saving humanity from the scourge of narrowness of all types, should more and more try to bring round all earnest thinkers and idealists of the world for a common basis of understanding and striving. The purpose of conferences for cultural freedom also gets fulfilled when intellectuals meet and confer with each other in a friendly way for solving problems affecting everyone in the modern world, which has become much shrunken by advancing scientific means of communication and contact.

Need we add a volume of this kind is very timely and useful?

K. CHANDRASEKHARAN

THE VEDANTA KAUMUDI OF RAMADVAYACARYA
Edited by S. Subrahmanya Sastri. Madras University Sanskrit Series No. 20, 1956. Rs. 12.

Traditional exponents of Advaita like Appayya Dīkṣita and Brahmānanda considered the work of Rāmādvaya as important; and among modern scholars, Das Gupta drew attention to this work in his *History of Indian Philosophy*. This important Advaita classic remained in manuscript and it was the desire and plan of the late Dr. T. R. Chintamani to bring out an edition of this work in the Madras University Sanskrit Series; after his demise the task has been accomplished by Sri S. Subrahmanya Sastri of the same Department. The edition is primarily based on the transcript in the Madras Government Oriental Mss. Library from a Malabar original

and an incomplete manuscript in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, from which variants are given at the end of the work.

The *Vedānta Kaumudī* is a Prakaraṇa devoted to the examination particularly of the doctrines figuring in the *Catus-sūtrī-bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara. Following the lead given by Śrīharṣa, the work tackles particularly Naiyāyikas who criticise Advaitins as out of court for carrying on discussions in view of their holding the universe as illusory; and while refuting the logicians, it is Udayana whom Rāmādvaya considers in the main in his criticisms. The author favours the *Ekajīva-vāda*, and on the different topics, follows one or the other of the two prasthānas, the *Vivaraṇa* or the *Bhāmatī*.

The world of Advaita scholars are indebted to the Sanskrit Department of the Madras University for the publication of such rare works which would help further advanced and specialised studies in the subject.

S. R. KRISHNAMURTI SASTRI

PANCADASI BY SWAMI VIDYARANYA, Translated by Hari Prasad Shastri, Santi Sadan, 29, Chepstow Villas, London, W. 11.

We are very sorry that as we notice this work, we have also to record the passing of its author, Sri Hari Prasad Shastri. The late Shastri hailed from U.P. and was the founder and moving-spirit of a centre for the study of Vedanta in London called the *Santi Sadan*. When I called on him more than once and had occasion to speak to the gathering of his followers at Santi Sadan, he recalled that he had some connection with South India too, for he had met Mr. Yogi Parthasarathi Ayyangar of Madras in the North and had come under his influence. Sri Shastri then went to Japan and later to England, where friends helped him to start the Vedantic *Santi Sadan* in London. Among stalwarts in the academic field, the name of Prof. H. H. Price of Oxford University must be mentioned for the support he lent to Sri Shastri's endeavour.

The *Santi Sadan* has a good membership and has attracted also men and women of University attainments who came under Sri Shastri's influence. They study Vedanta, attend prayers and bhajans, listen to discourses on Yoga,

Bhakti and Vedanta and assist in the literary work of Sri Shastri who translated into fluent English a number of Sanskrit works on Yoga, Bhakti and Vedanta. These works and his lectures are printed or cyclostyled and are in use by adherents of Vedanta on the continent also, as I myself found during my tour there.

Almost the last of Shastri's literary works is the translation of the *Vedānta Pañcadaśī* of Vidyāraṇya. Sri Shastri was specially devoted to Vidyāraṇya, as he told me, and at his request, I searched for a portrait of Vidyāraṇya and was able luckily to find for him a contemporary Vijayanagar temple painting of Saint Vidyāraṇya going in procession.

The *Pañcadaśī* occupies an important place in the traditional curriculum of Advaita Vedanta studies, as it presents clearly and succinctly the metaphysical and practical aspects of Śaṅkara's system. Sri Shastri did a distinct service to the European students of Vedanta and particularly his own friends at the Sadan, by placing this reputed classic in an English version in their hands.

It is hoped the inspiration that Sri Hari Prasad Shastri has left will vouchsafe the continuation of the valuable work of the *Santi Sadan* in London.

V. R.

SANKARADEVA AND HIS PREDECESSORS by Mahesvar Neog, M. A., Gauhati University. Lawyer's Book-stall, Gauhati, Assam, Rs. 5/-

The author, Mr. Maheshvar Neog, needs no introduction to readers of this journal where some of his writings have appeared. A member of the Post-Graduate Department of the Gauhati University, he has made special researches in the history and culture of Assam with special reference to the socio-religious and devotional-cum-artistic movements. Whether it is in respect of the new devotional upsurge or the efflorescence of the sacred dance-drama in Assam, the name which comes foremost is Śaṅkaradeva (1449-1568). Of the personality and work of Śaṅkaradeva as a religious leader and writer, there is need to have a proper account and evaluation, and we have them here in this monograph of Mr. Mahesvar Neog. The history of Vaishnavite renascence in Assam and the mission of Śaṅkaradeva cannot but remind one of Caitanya

and his contribution to Bengal. The book before us throws Śaṅkaradeva's personality in proper perspective, gives a biography of the Saint, deals with the work of his predecessors and Śaṅkaradeva's own contribution to both religion and literature.

As in Bengal, so in Assam, the home of Kāmākhyā and Tantra, the rise of the new devotional movement and the attendant artistic and cultural growth form a record of the further triumphant march of that great book, the *Bhāgavata*.

One who is acquainted with the history of the Bhāgavata-movement and the growth of bhajan and dance-drama in South India will find many parallel and helpful ideas in the history of these twin developments in Assam and we therefore welcome particularly this contribution of Mr. Maheshvar Neog.

V. R.

EXISTENTIALISM, A SURVEY AND ANCIENT INDIAN THOUGHT by K. Guru Dutt. Published by the Indian Institute of Culture, Bangalore. Pp. 80. Rs. 2.

The little volume under review is the substance of the author's three lectures delivered under the auspices of the Indian Institute of Culture. The two contemporary schools of Philosophy in the West are *Logical positivism* and *Existentialism*. The existentialist philosophy has held the field in the continent after the war and it depicts the prevailing philosophic temper of the age. It is all not one school of thought. There are theistic existentialists and atheists also in the camp. The atheist Sartre has popularised the doctrines of the system in his several plays, series of novels and independent tracts.

It is difficult to summarise the thought of the existentialists personwise. Each of them gives his own twist to the system. All of them are thinkers of ability and have their individual technique of expression. Sri Guru Dutt has given us an able, competent and lucid summary of Existentialism from the time of Socrates to Sartre. The survey falls into two parts, Chapter I, *The Background*, and Chapter II, *Modern Existentialism*. The survey is comprehensive, precise and is documented in all its statements. In the first chapter we have

the ancestry of existentialism laid bare, through the writings of Blaise Pascal, Soren Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. Chapter II gives us short accounts of the thought of Jaspers, Heidegger, Sartre and Marcel. It is no small intellectual feat to have covered the achievements of modern existentialists in over thirty pages.

In the concluding chapter Sri Dutt presents the affinities of the existentialist doctrines with Indian thought. He lays great stress on obvious analogies. The existentialist formula "Know Thyself" is the ground and the goal of Indian philosophic thought. The employment of the method of psychological analysis in existentialism is not without its parallel in the *Yoga* school and the *Advaita Vedānta* of Śaṅkara. The affinities indicated are instructive and interesting. Sri Dutt's comparison of Existentialism and Indian thought is the first of its kind. It is a valuable study in comparative philosophy. It is the inspiration, as the author records, of that platform of culture, the Indian Institute in Bangalore, fostered and run by the savants Shri B. P. Wadia and Srimati Sophia Wadia. The book is got up well and moderately priced.

P. NAGARAJA RAO

BHARATA SANGRAHA OF SRI LAKSHMANA SURI. Revised edition. The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras-4. 1956. Rs. 2-4-0.

The Mahābhārata is a well-known classic known to every Hindu. It consists of 18 Parvas mainly written in poetry though there are a few prose passages in the beginning. It is the biggest epic poem in the world. This has been condensed in prose of forceful style by the late Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Lakshmana Suri, the well-known Sanskrit scholar of South India. The book had been out of print for long, and the present edition has been issued to meet the persistent demand for the book by the public. The Institute is indebted to the Hon. Justice T. L. Venkatarama Iyer, the author's son, for his permission in bringing out this revised edition of the work.

Considering the bulk of the original, one can easily imagine the difficulty that must have been experienced by the learned author in condensing it within 144 pages without sacrificing the main trend of the story. The style is excellent and idiomatic. Selections from this work have been

rightly popular for text-book use in Matriculation and Intermediate classes.

Prose works in Sanskrit are rare and rarer are they in modern times. Works of the type now reviewed are very essential for young students of Sanskrit. The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Madras, should be congratulated on its publishing a new edition of this work and placing it in the hands of the public.

T. CHANDRASEKHARAN

SIX ST. THOMASES OF SOUTH INDIA—A MUSLIM NON-MORTYR (THAWWAMA) MADE MARTYRS AFTER 1517 A.D.—By T. K. Joseph, Chenganur P. O., Kerala State, 1955, Pp. 122, Rs. 2-8-0.

Apostle St. Thomas is one of the mysteries in the early phases of the history of Christianity in India. The author who has made an intensive study of the subject has written on it in different journals. All of them have been collected and presented in a connected form in this small book under review.

According to the author all the confusion regarding the saint has arisen out of the fact that there were really six persons bearing the name of Thomas and had connections with South India. After a detailed examination of all the available evidence on the subject he comes to the conclusion that St. Thomas had nothing to do with South India in spite of the confused and persistant tradition that says that he came to South India in 52 A. D. and became a martyr at Mylapore in 68 A.D. Whether one will accept the conclusions of the author or not, no one can deny the fact that Mr. T. K. Joseph has given us in this book a lot of important material on this interesting but eluding subject.

T. V. MAHALINGAM

OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	**Vibhramaviveka** of Maṇḍana Miśra—edited by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri and T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar ..	0	12	0
2.	**Vinavasavadatta** (an old Sanskrit drama) edited by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri and Dr. C. Kunhan Raja ..	0	8	0
3.	**Tolkappiyam** with an English translation by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Vol. I ..	1	0	0
4.	**History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil** by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ..	6	0	0
5.	**Dhvanyaloka & Locana** of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta with Kaumudī by Uttuṅgodaya and Upalocana edited by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, Sri T. V. Ramachandra Dikshitar and Dr. T. R. Chintamani, Uddyota I ..	8	0	0
6.	**The Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume.**	3	0	0
7.	**Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit** by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri ..	2	0	0
8.	**Compromises in the History of Vedanta** by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri ..	1	4	0
9.	**The Primer of Indian Logic** by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri (2nd Edn.) ..	10	0	0
10.	**Sankara Bhagavatpada** by Prof. P. Sankaranarayanan ..	0	4	0
11.	**Kuppuswami Sastri Memorial Volume** ..	2	0	0
12.	**Tolkappiyam-Porul-Atikaram-Tamil Poetics with English Transliteration, Translation and Notes,** 2 Parts by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ..	4	0	0
13.	**Literary Criticism in Sanskrit and English** by Prof. D. S. Sarma ..	1	0	0
14.	**Fundamental Aspirations of Man according to Indian Thought** by K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar ..	1	0	0
15.	**Grahacāranibandhana of Haridatta** (A Sourcebook of Kerala Astronomy) edited by K. V. Sarma.	1	0	0
16.	**Comparison of Indian and Western Philosophy and Sanskrit Studies Today** by D. H. H. Ingalls ..	1	0	0
17.	**The Journal of Oriental Research.** Annual Subscription ..	8	0	0

Copies can be had of: **The Secretaries**

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute

Mylapore, MADRAS-4.

Cin̲-men̲ mol̲iyār̲ cīr-pun̲ain ti-yāppin̲
Ammai tān̲-ē y-aṭi-nimir v-in̲r̲-ē.

Ammai is that which has not more than five lines made up of *cīr* composed of minimum words containing nasal sounds.

Note: The expression *aṭi-nimirvu*, according to *Pērāśiriyar* means "exceeding five lines".

539. செய்யுண் மொழியாற் சீர்புனைந் தியாப்பின்
அவ்வகை தானே யழகெனப் படுமே.
Ceyyuṇ mol̲i-yār̲ cīr-pun̲ain ti-yāppin̲
A-v-vakai tān̲-ē y-al̲ak-en̲a-p paṭum-ē.

Al̲akū is that which is made up of *cīr* containing poetic expressions.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* thinks that *ceyyuṇ-mol̲i* refers to words other than *tiri-col.*

540. தொன்மை தானே சொல்லுங் காலை[1]
உரையொடு புணர்ந்த பழமை மேற்றே.
Ton̲mai tān̲-ē colluṅ kālai
Uraiyoṭu puṇarnta pal̲amai mēr̲r̲ē.

Ton̲mai is that which deals with the incidents of old with explanations here and there.

541. இழுமென் மொழியான் விழுமியது நுவலினும்
பரந்த [2]மொழியா னடிநிமிர்ந் தொழுகினும்
தோலென மொழிப தொன்மொழிப்[3] புலவர்.
Il̲um-en̲ mol̲iyān̲ vil̲umiyatu nuvalin̲um
Paranta mol̲iyā n̲-aṭinimirn t-ol̲ukin̲um
Tōl-en̲a mol̲ipa ton̲-mol̲i-p pulavar.

Ancient writers say that *tōl* is that which deals with *dharma, artha, kāma* and *mōkṣa* in a mellifluous style or that which has more than five feet dealing with the topic in an elaborate way.

Note: *Paranta-mol̲i*, according to *Pērāśiriyar*, means *āciriyappā*. He also says that *ton̲-mol̲i* suggests that the plot should deal with incidents of old.

---

1. சொல்லுங்காலை is not found in *Naccin̲ārkkin̲iyam.*

2. *Mol̲iyal*, the reading of *Iḷampūranam* is evidently a scribal error, since the case suffix *al* is nowhere found in *Tolkāppiyam.*

3. *Iḷampūraṇar* reads தொன்னெறி for தொன்மொழி.

542. விருந்தே தானும்
புதுவது புனைந்த[1] யாப்பின் மேற்றே.
Viruntē tāṉ-um
Putuvatu puṉainta yāppiṉ mēṟṟē.

Viruntü is a composition in a modern style.

543. [2]ஞகார முதலா [3]னகார வீற்றுப்
புள்ளி யிறுதி யியைபெனப் படுமே.
Ñakāra mutal-ā ṉakāra v-īṟṟu-p
Puḷḷi y-iṟuti y-iyaip-eṉa-p paṭum-ē.

It is said that *iyaipü* is a poetic composition whose lines end in any consonant commencing with *ñ* and ending with *ṉ*.

544. [4]தெரிந்த மொழியாற் செவ்விதிற் கிளந்து
[5]தேர்தல் வேண்டாது குறித்தது தோன்றின்
புலனென மொழிப புலனுணர்ந் தோரே.
Terinta moḻiyāṟ cevvitiṟ kiḷantü
Tērtal vēṇṭātu kuṟittatu tōṉṟiṉ
Pulaṉ-eṉa moḻipa pulaṉ-uṇarn tōrē.

Those who are well versed in literature say that *pulaṉ* is a poetic composition composed of popular words whose meaning is so clear that there is no need for thinking.

545. ஒற்றொடு புணர்ந்த வல்லெழுத் தடங்காது
குறளடி முதலா வைந்தடி யொப்பித்து
ஓங்கிய மொழியா ஞாங்கவண் மொழியின்[6]
இழைபி னிலக்கண மியைந்த தாகும்.
Oṟṟoṭu puṇarnta valleḻut t-aṭaṅkātü
Kuṟaḷ-aṭi mutal-ā v-aintaṭi y-oppittü
Ōṅkiya moḻiyā ṉ-āṅk-avaṇ moḻiyiṉ
Iḻaipi ṉ-ilakkaṇa m-iyainta t-ākum.

The definition of *iḻaipü* is that it is a poetic composition consisting of the five types of *aṭi* from *kuṟaḷ-aṭi* onwards which are made up of *cīr* containing long vowels and voiced consonants and avoiding voiceless consonants not followed by vowels.

---

1. புனைந்த (இளம்.); கிளந்த (பேரா.).
2. ஞகாரம் (இளம்.); ஞகாரை (பேரா.).
3. னகாரம் (இளம்.); னகாரை (பேரா.).
4. தெரிந்த (இளம்.); சேரி (பேரா.).
5. தேர்தல் (இளம்.); ஓதல் (பேரா.).
6. ஆங்கவண் மொழியின் (இளம்.); ஆங்கன மொழுகின் (பேரா.).

546. செய்யுண் மருங்கின் மெய்பெற நாடி
இழைத்த விலக்கணம் பிழைத்தது போல
[1]வருவன வுளவெனும் வந்தவற் றியலான்
திரிபின்றி முடித்த றெள்ளியோர் கடனே.
Ceyyuṇ maruṅkiṉ mey-peṟa nāṭi
Iḻaitta v-iḻakkaṇam piḻaittatu pōla
Varuvaṉa v-uḷa-v-eṉum vantavaṟ ṟiyalāṉ
Tirupiṉṟi muṭitta ṟeḷḷiyōr kaṭaṉ-ē.

It is the duty of the clear-visioned scholars that, on careful examination, if they find in literature anything not mentioned in the foregoing *sūtras* of grammar, they should admit it in the fold of the above.

(*Ceyyuḷ-iyal ends.*)

1. வருவன வுளவெனும் (இளம்.); வருப வுளவேனும் (நச்.); வருவ வுளவெனினும் (பேரா.).

IX. MARAPIYAL.

(Chapter on traditional usage).

547. மாற்றருஞ் சிறப்பின் மரபியல் கிளப்பின்
பார்ப்பும் பறழுங் குட்டியுங் குருளையும்
கன்றும் பிள்ளையு மகவு மறியுமென்று
ஒன்பதுங் குழவியொ டிளமைப் பெயரே.

Māṟṟaruñ ciṟappiṉ marapiyal kiḷappiṉ
Pārppum paṟaḻ-un kuṭṭi-y-uṅ kuruḷai-y-um
Kaṉṟum piḷḷai-y-u makavu maṟi-y-um-eṉṟŭ
Oṉpat-uṅ kuḻaviyo ṭ-iḷamai-p peyar-ē.

Marapiyal of great superiority commencing, the following nine names are used to denote the young of objects, *pārppu paṟaḻ, kuṭṭi, kuraḷai, kaṉṟŭ, piḷḷai, makavu, maṟi* and *kuḻavi.*

Note. The first line in this *sūtra* may be taken in the following *sūtras* also.

548. [1]எருது மேற்றையு மொருத்தலுங் களிறும்
சேவுஞ் சேவலு மிரலையுங் கலையும்
மோத்தையுந் தகரு முதளு மப்பரும்
போத்துங் கண்டியுங் கடுவனும் பிறவும்
யாத்த வாண்பாற் பெயரென மொழிப.

Erutu m-ēṟṟai-y-u m-oruttal-uṅ kaḷiṟum
Cē-v-uñ cēval-u m-iralai-y-uṅ kalai-y-um
Mōttai-y-un takar-u m-utaḷ-u m-appar-um
Pōttuṅ kaṇṭi-y-uṅ kaṭuvaṉ-um piṟa-v-um
Yātta v-āṇpāṟ peyar-eṉa moḻipa.

They say that the following names are used to denote the male of objects, *erutŭ, ēṟṟai, oruttal, kaḷiṟŭ, cē, cēval, iralai, kalai, mōttai, takar, utaḷ, appar, pōttŭ, kaṇṭi, kaṭuvaṉ etc.*

549. பேடையும் பெடையும் பெட்டையும் பெண்ணும்
மூடு நாகுங் கடமையு மளகும்
மந்தியும் பாட்டியும் பிணையும் பிணவும்
அந்தஞ் சான்ற பிடியொடு பெண்ணே.

Pēṭai-y-um peṭai-y-um peṭṭai-y-um peṇ-ṇ-um
Mūṭu nākuṅ kaṭamai-y-u m-aḷakum
Manti-y-um pāṭṭi-y-um piṇai-y-um piṇa-v-um
Antañ cāṉṟa piṭiyoṭu peṇ-ṇ-ē.

---

1. ஏறு (பா. ம்.),

The following names denote the female of objects: *pēṭai, peṭai, peṭṭai, peṇ, mūṭu, nāku, kaṭamai, aḷaku, manti, pāṭṭi, piṇai, piṇavu, piṭi* etc.

550. அவற்றுள்
பார்ப்பும் பிள்ளையும் பறப்பவற் றிளமை.
Avaṟṟuḷ
Pārppum piḷḷaiyum paṟappavaṟ ṟ-iḷamai.

Of them, the words *pārppu* and *piḷḷai* are used to denote the young of birds.

Note. This *sūtra* is a *viśeṣa-sūtra* to the *sūtra* No. 1 which is a *sāmanyasūtra.*

551. தவழ்பவை தாமு மவற்றோ ரன்ன.
Tavaḻ-pavai tām-u m-avaṟṟō r-aṉṉa.

The crawling objects too are of the same nature *i.e.*, the above words are used to denote the young of crawling creatures.

552. மூங்கா வெருகெலி மூவரி யணிலொடு
ஆங்கவை நான்குங் குட்டிக் குரிய.
Mūṅkā veruk-eli mū-vari y-aṇiloṭu
Āṅkavai nāṉkuṅ kuṭṭik k-uriya.

Mūṅkā (a kind of mungoose), *veruku* (wild cat), rat, and squirrel having three lines take the word *kuṭṭi* to denote their young.

553. பறழெனப் படினு முறழாண் டில்லை.
Paṟaḻ-eṉa-p paṭiṉu m-uṟaḻ-āṇ ṭ-illai.

There is no harm if the word *paṟaḻ* is used to denote the young of the above four.

554. நாயே பன்றி புலிமுய னான்கும்
ஆயுங் காலைக் குருளை யென்ப.
Nāy-ē paṉṟi puli-muya ṉāṉkum
Āyuṅ kālai-k kuruḷai y-eṉpa.

They say that, on examination, *kuruḷai* is the term to denote the young of dog, pig, tiger, and hare.

555. நரியு மற்றே நாடினர் கொளினே.
Nari-y-u m-aṟṟē nāṭiṉar koḷiṉ-ē.

On examination, the youg of fox too is called the same i.e., *kuruḷai.*

556. குட்டியும் பறழுங் கூற்றவண் வரையார்.
Kuṭṭi-y-um paṟal-uṅ kūṟṟavaṇ varaiyār.

They do not prohibit the use of *kuṭṭi* and *paṟal* with reference to them.

Note. Only the word *kuṭṭi* has lived in later times with reference to those five.

557. பிள்ளைப் பெயரும் பிழைப்பாண் டில்லை
கொள்ளுங் காலை நாயலங் கடையே.
Piḷḷai-p peyar-um piḻaippāṇ ṭ-illai
Koḷḷuṅ kālai nāy-alaṅ kaṭai-y-ē.

There is no harm if the term *piḷḷai* is used with reference to them except the dog.

558. ஆடுங் குதிரையும் நவ்வியு முழையும்
ஓடும் புல்வா யுளப்பட மறியே.
Āṭuṅ kutirai-y-um navvi-y-u muḻai-y-um
Ōṭum pulvā y-uḷappaṭa maṟi-y-ē.

Maṟi is the term used to denote the young of the sheep and goat, horse, spotted deer, deer and antelope.

Note 1. *Muḻai* found in *Iḷampūraṇam* is a misprint for *uḻai*. It might have been an interpolation.

Note 2. The adjunct *ōṭum* to the noun *pulvāy* does not serve any useful purpose.

559. கோடுவாழ் [1]குரங்குங் குட்டி கூறுப.
Kōṭu-vāḻ kuraṅkuṅ kuṭṭi kūṟupa.

They use *kuṭṭi* even with reference to monkeys living in the branches of trees.

560. மகவும் பிள்ளையும் பறழும் பார்ப்பும்
அவையு மன்ன வப்பா லான.
Makavum piḷḷai-y-um paṟal-um pārppum
Avai-y-u m-aṉṉa v-a-p-pā lāṉ-a.

The terms *makavu*, *piḷḷai*, *paṟal*, and *pārppu* also are used to denote the young of monkeys.

561. யானையுங் குதிரையுங் கழுதையுங் கடமையும்
ஆனோ டைந்துங் கன்றெனற் குரிய.
Yāṉai-y-uṅ kutirai-yuṅ kaḻutai-y-uṅ kaṭamai-y-um
Āṉo ṭaintuṅ kaṉṟ-eṉaṟ k-uriya.

---

1. குரக்கு குட்டியும் (இளம்.); குரக்குக்குட்டி (பேரா.).

The term *kaṉṟu* belongs to the young of elephant, horse, ass, elk and cow.

Note. The expression *mārirāka* in *Iḷampūraṇam* should be *āiṟāka*.

562. எருமையு மரையும் வரையா ராண்டே.

Erumai-y-u marai-y-um varaiyā r-āṇṭē.

They do not prohibit the term *kaṉṟu* to denote the end of buffalo and *marai* (bison) also.

563. கவரியுங் கராமு[1] நிகரவற் றுள்ளே.

Kavari-y-uṅ karām-u nikaravaṟ ṟuḷḷē.

Kavari (yak) and *karā* (alligator) take the same term *kaṉṟu*.

Note: Since *karām* is read in the *sūtra 37*, *karākam* seems to be an error.

564. ஒட்டக மவற்றோ டொருவழி நிலையும்.

Oṭṭaka m-avaṟṟō ṭ-oru-vaḻi nilaiyum.

Camel also agrees with them (in taking *kaṉṟu* to denote their young).

565. குஞ்சரம் பெறுமே குழவிப் பெயர்க்கொடை.

Kuñcaram peṟum-ē kuḻavi-p peyar-k-koṭai.

Elephant receives the term *kuḻavi* (to denote the young).

566. ஆவு மெருமையு [2]மதுசொலப் படுமே.

Ā-v-u m-erumai-y-u m-atu- cola-p paṭum-ē.

Ā (cow) and *erumai* (buffalo) too take that term (*kuḻavi*).

567. கடமையு மரையு முதனிலை யொன்றும்.

Kaṭamai-y-u marai-y-u mutaṉilai y-oṉṟum.

Kaṭamai and *marai* agree with those mentioned above.

568. குரங்கு முசவு மூகமு மூன்றும்
நிரம்ப நாடி னப்பெயர்க் குரிய.

Kuraṅku mucu-v-u m-ūkam-u mūṉṟum
Nirampa nāṭi ṉ-a-p-peyar-k k-uriya.

The three *kuraṅku*, *mucu*, and *ūkam* deserve, on careful examination, the same term *kuḻavi* (to denote the young).

---

1. கராகம் (இளம்.); கரா (பேரா.); கராகம்=கரடி (bear).
2. அது (இளம்.); அவை (பேரா.).

569. குழவியு மகவு மாயிரண் டல்லவை
கிழவ வல்ல மக்கட் கண்ணே.
Kuḻavi-y-u makavu m-ā-y-iraṇ ṭ-allavai
Kiḻava v-alla makkaṭ kaṇ-ṇ-ē.

No term other than *kuḻavi* and *makavu* can be used to denote the young of human beings.

570. பிள்ளை குழவி கன்றே போத்தெனக்
கொள்ளவு மமையு மோரறி வுயிர்க்கே.
Piḷḷai kuḻavi kaṉṟē pōtt-eṉa-k
Koḷḷa-v-u m-amaiyu m-ōr-ari vuyir-kk-ē.

The terms *piḷḷai, kuḻavi, kaṉṟu,* and *pōttu* may be used to denote the young of living organisms having the sense of touch alone.

571. நெல்லும் புல்லு நேரா ரண்டே.
Nel-l-um pul-l-u nērā r-āṇṭē.

Nel (paddy plant) and grass do not take them.

572. சொல்லிய மரபி னிளமை தானே
சொல்லுங் காலை யவையல திலவே.

Colliya marapi ṉiḷamai tāṉ-ē
Colluṅ kālai y-avai-ala t-ila-v-ē.

There is no term other than those mentioned above used to denote the young of objects.

573. ஒன்றறி வதுவே யுற்றறி வதுவே
இரண்டறி வதுவே யதனொடு நாவே
மூன்றறி வதுவே யவற்றொடு மூக்கே
நான்கறி வதுவே யவற்றொடு கண்ணே
ஐந்தறி வதுவே யவற்றொடு செவியே
ஆறறி வதுவே யவற்றொடு மனனே
நேரிதி னுணர்ந்தோர் நெறிப்படுத் தினரே.
Oṉṟaṟi vatu-v-ē y-uṟṟaṟi vatu-v-ē
Iraṇṭaṟi vatu-v-ē y-ataṉoṭu nā-v-ē
Mūṉṟaṟi vatu-v-ē y-avaṟṟoṭu mūkkē
Nāṉkaṟi vatu-v-ē y-avaṟṟoṭu kaṇ-ṇ-ē
Aintaṟi vatu-v-ē y-avaṟṟoṭu cevi-y-ē
Āṟaṟi vatu-v-ē y-avaṟṟoṭu maṉaṉ-ē
Nēriti n-uṇarntōr neṟippaṭut tiṉar-ē.

Scholars have classified living organisms under six heads:—*Ōr-ariv-uyir* having the sense of touch alone, *īr-ariv-uyir* having the senses of touch and taste, *mū-v-ariv-uyir*

having the senses of touch, taste and smell, *nāl-aṟiv-uyir* having the senses of touch, taste, smell and sight, *ai-y-aṟiv-uyir* having the senses of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing and *āṟ-aṟiv-uyir* having the power of discrimination in addition to the above five senses.

574. புல்லு மரனு மோரறி வினவே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Pul-l-u maraṉ-u m-ōr-aṟi viṉa-v-ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-akkiḷai-p piṟapp-ē.

575. நந்து முரளு மீரறி வினவே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Nantu muraḷ-u m-īr-aṟi viṉa-v-ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-a-k-kiḷai-p piṟapp-ē.

Snail and shell-fish belong to the class of *ir-aṟiv-uyir*; there are others also belonging to it.

576. சிதலு மெறும்பு மூவறி வினவே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Cital-u m-eṟumpu mū-v-aṟi viṉa-v.ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-a-k-kiḷai-p piṟapp-ē.

Termite and ant belong to the class of *mū-v-aṟiv-uyir*; there are others also belonging to it.

577. நண்டுந் தும்பியு நான்கறி வினவே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Naṇṭu-n tumpi-y-u nāṉ-k-aṟi viṉa-v-ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-a-k-kiḷai-p piṟappē.

Crab and bee belong to the class of *nāṉk-aṟiv-uyir*: there are others also belonging to it.

578. மாவும் [1]புள்ளு மையறி வினவே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Mā-v-um puḷ-ḷ-u m-ai-y-aṟi viṉa-v-ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-a-k-kiḷai-p piṟappē.

Animals and birds belong to the class of *ai-y-aṟiv-uyir*; there are others also belonging to it.

579. மக்க டாமே யாறறி வுயிரே
பிறவு முளவே யக்கிளைப் பிறப்பே.
Makka ṭām-ē y-āṟ-aṟi v-uyir-ē
Piṟa-v-u m-uḷa-v-ē y-a-k-kiḷai-p piṟappē.

---

1. புள்ளும் (இளம்.); மாக்களும் (பேரா.).

Human beings belong to the class of *ā̱ṟaṟivuyir*; there are others also belonging to it.

580. ஒருசார் விலங்கு முளவென மொழிப.

Oru-cār vilaṅku m-uḷa-v-eṉa moḻipa.

They say that a class of animals also belong to that type (*āṟ-aṟiv-uyir*).

The following *sūtras* form the *viśēṣa-sūtras* of *sūtra* 2 of this *iyal*.

581. வேழக் குரித்தே விதந்துகளி றென்றல்.

Vēḻa-k k-uritt-ē vitantu-kaḷi ṟ-eṉṟal.

The term *kaḷiṟu* is used with reference to the male of elephants.

582. கேழற் கண்ணுங் கடிவரை யின்றே.

Kēḻaṟ kaṇ-ṇ-uṅ kaṭi-varai y-iṉ-ṟē.

It is not strictly prohibited to use it to denote boar.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* takes both the above *sūtras* as one.

583. புல்வாய் புலியுழை மரையே கவரி
சொல்லிய கராமொ டொருத்த லொன்றும்.

Pulvāy puliyuḻai marai-y-ē kavari
Colliya karāmo ṭ-orutta l-oṉṟum.

The term *oruttal* is used with reference to the male of antelope, tiger, deer, *marai, kavari* and alligator.

584. வார்கோட் டியானையும் பன்றியு மன்ன.

Vār-kōṭ ṭi-yāṉai-y-um paṉṟi-y-u m-aṉṉa.

Elephant having big tusks and boar are of the same kind; *i.e.*, they take the term *oruttal* also.

585. ஏற்புடைத் தென்ப வெருமைக் கண்ணும்.

Ēṟpuṭait t-eṉpa v-erumaik kaṇ-ṇ-um.

The term *oruttal* may be used to denote even the male of buffalo.

586. பன்றி புல்வா யுழையே கவரி
என்றிவை நான்கு மேறெனற் குரிய.

Paṉṟi pulvā y-uḻai-y-ē kavari
Eṉṟ-ivai nāṉku m-ēṟ-eṉaṟ k-uriya.

The male of the four, *paṉṟi, pulvāy, uḻai*and *kavari*, may also be called *ēṟu*.

587. எருமையு மரையும் பெற்றமு மன்ன.

Erumai-y-u marai-y-um peṟṟam-u m-aṉṉa.

Erumai, marai and *perram* also are of the same nature; *i.e.*, their male may be called *ērū*.

588. கடல்வாழ் சுறவு மேறெனப் படுமே.

Kaṭal-vāḻ curavu m-ēr-enap paṭum-ē.

The male of *curā* living in sea also may be called *ērū*.

589. பெற்ற மெருமை புலிமரை புல்வாய்
மற்றிவை யெல்லாம் போத்தெனப் படுமே.

Perra m-erumai puli-marai pulvāy
Marrivai y-ellām pōttena-p paṭum-ē.

The male of *perram, erumai, puli, marai, pulvāy* etc. is called *pōttū*.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* takes that *marrivai* refers to *panri, ōtti* etc.

590. நீர்வாழ் சாதியு மதுபெறற் குரிய.

Nīr-vāḻ cāti-y-u m-atu-perar k-uriya.

There are some in aquatic animals which take the term *pōttū* to denote their male.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* takes the reading *aru-piṟappū uriya* and tells *arupiṟappū* refers to *curā, mutalai, itaṅkar, karā, varāl* and *vāḷai.*

591. மயிலு மெழாஅலும் பயிலத் தோன்றும்.

Mayil-u m-eḻāal-um payila-t tōnrum.

Pōttū appears with reference to the male of *mayil* and *eḻāl.*

592. இரலையுங் கலையும் புல்வாய்க் குரிய.

Iralai-y-uṅ kalai-y-um pulvāyk k-uriya.

The terms *iralai* and *kalai* may be used to denote the male of *pulvāy*.

593. கலையென் காட்சி யுழைக்கு முரித்தே.

Kalai-ye-n kāṭci y-uḻaikku m-uritt-ē.

The term *kalai* is used with reference to the male of *uḻai* also.

594. நிலையிற் றப்பெயர் முசுவின் கண்ணும்.

Nilayir r-a-p-peyar mucuvin kaṇ-ṇ-um.

The same term *kalai* is used with regard to the male of *mucu*.

Note. The above two *sūtras* are read as one by *Iḷampūraṇar*.

595. மோத்தையுந் தகரு முதளு மப்பரும்
யாத்த வென்ப யாட்டின் கண்ணே.
Mōttai-y-um takar-u mutaḷ-u m-appar-um
Yātta v-eṉpa yāṭṭiṉ kaṇ-ṇ-ē.

The terms *mōttai*, *takar*, *mutaḷ*, and *appar* are used to denote the male of goat or sheep.

596. சேவற் பெயர்க்கொடை சிறகொடு சிவணும்
மாயிருந் தூவி மயிலலங் கடையே.
Cēvaṟ peyar-k-koṭai ciṟakoṭu civaṇum
Mā-y-irun tūvi mayil-alaṅ kaṭai-y-ē.

The term *cēval* is used to denote the male of birds except peacock with a big long tail.

597. ஆற்றலொடு புணர்ந்த வாண்பாற் கெல்லாம்
ஏற்றைக் கிளவி யுரித்தென மொழிப.
Āṟṟaloṭu puṇarnta v-āṇpāṟ k-ellām
Ēṟṟai-k kiḷavi y-uritt-e-ṉa moḻipa.

The term *ēṟṟai*, they say, may be used to denote the male of all valiant beings.

598. ஆண்பா லெல்லா மாணெனற் குரிய
பெண்பா லெல்லாம் பெண்ணெனற் குரிய
காண்பவை யவையவை யப்பா லான.

Āṇpā l-ellā m-āṉ-eṉaṟ k-uriya
Peṇpā l-ellām peṇ-ṇ-eṉaṟ k-uriya
Kāṇpavai y-avai-y-avai y-a-p-pā lāṉ-a.

The word *āṇ* may be used to denote the male of all beings and *peṇ*, the female, since such a usage is found in the world.

The following *sūtras* form the *viśēṣa-sūtras* of *sūtra* 3 of this *iyal*.

599. பிடியென் பெண்பெயர் யானை மேற்றே.
Piṭi-y-eṉ peṇ-peyar yāṉai mēṟṟ-ē.

The female term *piṭi* is used with reference to elephant.

600. ஒட்டகங் குதிரை கழுதை மரையிவை
பெட்டை யென்னும் பெயர்க்கொடைக் குரிய.
Oṭṭakaṅ kutirai kaḻutai marai-y-ivai
Peṭṭai y-eṉṉum peyar-k-koṭaik k-uriya.

The female term *peṭṭai* is used with reference to camel horse, ass and bison.

601. புள்ளு முரிய வப்பெயர்க் கென்ப.
Puḷ-ḷ-u m-uriya v-a-p-peyark k-eṉpa.

The same term may be used with reference to the female of birds.

602. பேடையும் பெடையு நாடி னொன்றும்.
Pēṭai-y-um peṭai-y-u nāṭi ṉ-oṉṟum.

Pēṭai and *peṭai* are used, on examination, to denote the female of birds.

Note: *Puḷ* is taken here from the previous *sūtra* and is changed to *puḷḷiṉkaṉ*.

603. கோழி கூகை யாயிரண் டல்லவை
சூழுங் காலை யளகென லமையா.
Kōḻi kūkai y-ā-y-iraṇ ṭ-allavai
Cūḻuṅ kālai y-aḷak-eṉa l-amaiyā.

The term *aḷakū* is not used to denote the female of beings other than fowl and owl.

604. அப்பெயர்க் கிழமை மயிற்கு முரித்தே.
A-p-peyar-k kiḻamai mayiṟku m-uritt-ē.

The same term holds good to peahen also.

Note: *Iḷampūraṇam* reads in the *sūtra peṇpālāṉa* also. Since similar word is not used in other *sūtras*, it may have been an interpolation.

605. புல்வாய் நவ்வி யுழையே கவரி
சொல்வாய் நாடிற் பிணையெனப் படுமே.
Pulvāy navvi y-uḻai-y-ē kavaṟi
Colvāy nāṭiṟ piṇai-y-eṉa-p paṭum-ē.

On examining usage, the term *piṇai* is seen denoting the female of *pulvāy, navvi, uḻai* and *kavari*.

606. பன்றி புல்வாய் நாயென மூன்றும்
ஒன்றிய வென்ப பிணவென் பெயர்க்கொடை.
Paṉṟi pulvāy nāy-eṉa mūṉṟum
Oṉṟiya v-eṉpa piṇav-eṉ peyar-k-koṭai.

The term *piṇavu* is appropriate to the female of *paṉṟi, pulvāy* and *nāy*.

607. பிணவ லெனினு மவற்றின் மேற்றே.
Piṇava l-eṉiṉu m-avaṟṟiṉ mēṟṟ-ē.

The term *piṇaval* also is used with reference to them.

608. பெற்றமு மெருமையு மரையு மாவே.

Peṟṟam-u m-erumai-y-u marai-y-u m-ā-v-ē.

The term *ā* is used to denote the female of *peṟṟam*, *erumai* and *marai*.

609. பெண்ணும் பிணவு மக்கட் குரிய.

Peṇ-ṇ-um piṇavu makkaṭ k-uriya.

Peṇ and *piṇavu* are the appropriate terms with reference to human beings.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* reads here *piṇā* though he reads *piṇavu* in the third *sūtra*..

610. எருமையு மரையும் பெற்றமு நாகே.

Erumai-y-u marai-y-um peṟṟam-u nāk-ē.

The term *nākü* is used to denote the female of *erumai*, *marai* and *peṟṟam*.

611. நீர்வாழ் சாதியு ணந்து நாகே.

Nīr-vāḻ cātiyu ṇantu nāk-ē.

Nākü is used with reference to *ṇantu* among aquatic animals.

612. மூடுங் கடமையும் யாடல பெறா அ.

Mūṭuṅ kaṭamai-y-um yāṭ-ala peṟāa.

The terms *mūṭü* and *kaṭamai* are not used with reference to any other than *yāṭü*.

613. பாட்டி யென்ப[1] பன்றியு நாயும்.

Pāṭṭi y-eṉpa paṉṟi-y-u nāy-um.

Paṉṟi and *nāy* take the terms *pāṭṭi*, they say.

614. நரியு மற்றே நாடினர் கொளினே.

Nari-y-u m-aṟṟē nāṭiṉar koḷiṉ-ē.

If carefully examined, *nari* also belongs to them, *i.e.*, it takes the term *pāṭṭi*.

615. குரங்கு முசுவு மூகமு மந்தி.

Kuraṅku mucu-v-u m-ūkam-u manti.

Manti is the term used to denote the female of *kuraṅkü*, *mucu*, and *ūkam*.

616. குரங்கினு ளேற்றைக்[1] கடுவ னென்றலும்
மரம்பயில் கூகையைக் கோட்டா னென்றலும்

1. என்ப (இளம்.); என்பது (பேரா.).

செவ்வாய்க் கிள்ளையைத் தத்தை யென்றலும்
வெவ்வாய் வெருகினைப் பூசை யென்றலும்
குதிரையு ளாணினைச் சேவ லென்றலும்
இருணிறப் பன்றியை யேன மென்றலும்
எருமையு ளாணினைக் கண்டி யென்றலும்
முடிய வந்த [2]வழக்கி னுண்மையின்
கடிய லாகா கடனறிந் தோர்க்கே.

Kuraṅkiṉu ḷ-ēṟṟai-k kaṭuva ṉ-eṉṟal-um
Marampayil kūkaiyai-k kōṭṭā ṉ-eṉṟalum
Cev-vāy-k kiḷḷayai-t tattai y-eṉṟalum
Vev-vāy verukiṉai-p pūcai y-eṉṟalum
Kutiraiyu ḷ-āṇiṉai-c cēva l-eṉṟalum
Iruniṟa-p paṉṟiyai y-ēṉa m-eṉṟal-um
Erumaiyu ḷ-āṇiṉai-k kaṇṭi y-eṉṟal-um
Muṭiya vanta vaḻakki ṉ-uṇmaiyiṉ
Kaṭiya l-ākā kaṭaṉ-aṟin tōrkk-ē.

It is not proper to those conversant with the history of language and the usage to avoid the following terms: *Kaṭuvaṉ* to denote the male of monkeys, *kōṭṭāṉ* to denote the *owl* living in the trees, *tattai* to denote fine-mouthed parrot, *pūcai* to denote ferocious wild cat, *cēval* to denote the male of horse, *ēṉam* to denote black pig and kaṇṭi to denote the male of buffalo.

617. பெண்ணு மாணும் பிள்ளையு மவையே.
Peṇ-ṇ-u m-āṇ-um piḷḷai-y-u m-avai-y-ē.

The terms *peṇ*, *āṇ* and *piḷḷai* belong to the above category.

618. நூலே கரக முக்கோன் மணையே
ஆயுங் காலை யந்தணர்க் குரிய.
Nūl-ē karaka mukkōṉ maṇai-y-ē
Āyuṅ kālai y-antaṇark k-uriya.

Sacred thread, jar, trident staff and seat are to be held by *antaṇar*, (high class brahmans).

619. படையுங் கொடியுங் குடையு முரசும்
நடைநவில் புரவியுங் களிறுந் தேரும்
தாரு முடியு நேர்வன பிறவும்
தெரிவுகொள் செங்கோ லரசர்க் குரிய.

---

1. ஏற்றை (இளம்.); ஏற்றினை (பேரா.).
2. வழக்கின் (இளம்.); அவ்வழக்கு (பேரா.).

Paṭai-y-uṅ koṭi-y-uṅ kuṭai-y-u muracum
Naṭai-navil puravi-y-uṅ kaḷiṟun tēr-um
Tār-u muṭi-y-u nērvaṉa piṟa-v-um
Terivu-koḷ ceṅkō l-aracark k-uriya.

The following are to be held by benignly ruling kings: army, flag, umbrella, war-drum, swift cavalry, elephantry, chariots, rank and file of an army, crown and others which are necessary.

620. அந்த ணாளர்க் குரிய வு மரசர்க்கு
ஒன்றிய வரூஉம் பொருளுமா ருளவே.
Anta ṇāḷark k-uriya-v-u m-aracarkkü
Oṉṟiya varūum poruḷ-um-ā r-uḷa-v-ē.

There are things worthy to be held by high class brahmans, which may be held by kings.

Note. They are, according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, *ōtal, vēṭṭal, vēṭpittal*, and *iṭal* and according to *Pērāśiriyar nūl, maṇai* etc.

621. பரிசில் பாடாண் டிணைத்துறைக் கிழப்பெயர்[1]
நெடுந்தகை செம்ம லென்றிவை பிறவும்
பொருந்தச் சொல்லுத லவர்க்குரித் தன்றே.
Paricil pāṭāṉ ṭiṇai-t-tuṟai-k kiḻa-p-peyar
Neṭun-takai cemma l-eṉṟ-ivai piṟa-v-um
Porunta-c colluta l-avarkk-urit t-aṉṟ-ē.

Antaṇar, if there is propriety, may be appealed for gifts, may be praised for their patronage, fame etc. and may be addressed by the terms *neṭuntakai, cemmal* etc.

Note: *Urittaṉṟü* is a positive verb according to *Iḷampūraṇar* and a negative verb according to *Pērāśiriyar*. Hence, *Pērāśiriyar* gives the meaning diametrically opposite to the above.

622. ஊரும் பெயரு முடைத்தொழிற் கருவியும்
யாருஞ் சார்த்தி யவையவை பெறுமே.
Ūr-um peyar-u m-uṭai-t-toḻiṟ karuvi-y-um
Yār-uñ cārtti y-avai-y-avai peṟum-ē.

All castes take their residence, name and implements of their trade suited to them.

623. தலைமைக் குணச்சொல்லுந் தத்தமக் குரியதோர்[2]
நிலைமைக் கேற்ப நிகழ்த்துப வென்ப.

---

1. கிழப்பெயர் (இளம்.); கிழமைப்பெயர் (பேரா.).
2. உரியதோர் (இளம்.); உரிய (பேரா.).

Talaimaik kuṇa-c-col-l-un tattamak k-uriyat-ōr
Nılaimaik k-ēṟpa nikaḻttupa v-eṉpa.

They say that words denoting the predominant quality suited to their taste are used.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* says that *Brahmans* are associated with *Brahmā*, *Kṣatriyas* with *Viṣṇu*, Vaiśyas with *Kubēra* and *Vēḷāḷas* with *Varuṇa*.

624. இடையிரு வகையோ ரல்லது நாடின்
படைவகை பெறாஅ ரென்மனார் புலவர்.
Iṭai-y-iru vakaiyō r-allatu nāṭiṉ
Paṭai-vakai peṟāa r-eṉmaṉār pulavar.

Learned men say that, on examination, none other than the two middle castes, *i.e.*, *Kṣatriyas* and *Vaiśyas* take to army.

Note: *Nāṭiṉ* suggests, according to *Pērāśiriyar*, that *Brahmans* and *Vēḷāḷas* rarely enlist themsleves in army.

625. வைசிகன் பெறுமே வாணிக வாழ்க்கை.
Vaicikaṉ peṟum-ē vāṇika vāḻkkai.

Vaiśya takes to trade.

626. மெய்தெரி வகையி னெண்வகை யுணவின்
செய்தியும் வரையா ரப்பா லான.
Mey-teri vakaiyi ṉ-eṇ-vakai y-uṇaviṉ
Ceytiy-um varaiyā r-a-p-pā lāṉ-a.

They do not prohibit them from producing the eight kinds of food in a suitable manner.

Note: The eight kinds of food are, according to *Iḷampūraṇam*, *nel*, *kāṇam*, *varakŭ*, *iṟuṅkŭ*, *tiṉai*, *cāmai*, *pul* and *kōtumpai* and according to *Pērāśiriyar*, *payaṟŭ*, *uḻuntŭ*, *kaṭukŭ*, *kaṭalai*, *eḷ*, *koḷ*, *avarai*, and *tuvarai*.

627. கண்ணியுந் தாரு மெண்ணின ராண்டே.
Kaṇṇi-y-un tār-u m-eṇṇiṉa r-āṇṭ-ē.

They have stated that *Vaiśyas* deserve to have flowers and garlands.

628. வேளாண் மாந்தர்க் குழுதூ ணல்லது
இல்லென மொழிப பிறவகை நிகழ்ச்சி.
Vēḷāṇ māntark k-uḻutū ṇ-allatŭ
Il-l-eṉa moḻipa piṟa-vakai nikaḻcci.

Vēḷāḻas have no profession, they say, other than agriculture.

L

629. வேந்துவிடு தொழிலிற் படையுங் கண்ணியும்
வாய்ந்தன ரென்ப வவர்பெறும் பொருளே.
Vēntu-viṭu toḻiliṟ paṭai-u-ṅ kaṇṇi-y-um
Vāyntaṉa r-eṉpa v-avar-peṟum poruḷ-ē.

They are worthy of having weapons and flowers, if they are sent on Government business.

630. அந்த ணாளர்க் கரசுவரை வின்றே.
Anta ṇāḷark k-aracu-varai v-iṉṟ-ē.

Sovereignty is not prohibited to *antaṇar*.

631. வில்லும் வேலுங் கழலுங்[1] கண்ணியும்
தாரு மாரமுந் தேரு மாவும்[2]
மன்பெறு மரபி னேனோர்க் குரிய.
Vil-l-um vēl-uṅ kaḻal-uṅ kaṇṇi-y-um
Tār-u m-āram-un tēr-u mā-v-um,
Maṉ-peṟu marapi ṉ-ēṉōrk k-uriya.

Bow, spear, anklet, *kaṇṇi*, *tār*, *āram*, chariot and cavalry may be had by others of high position.

Note: They are called *kuṟu-nila-maṉṉar*.

632. அன்ன ராயினு மிழிந்தோர்க் கில்லை.
Aṉṉa r-āyiṉu m-iḻintōrk k-illai.

Those who are qualified to have them are not entitled to have them, if they are degraded in position.

633. புறக்கா ழனவே புல்லெனப் படுமே.[3]
Puṟa-k-kā ḻ-aṉa-v-ē pul-l-eṉa-p paṭum-ē.

Vegetable kingdom whose outer part is of close grain is called *pul*.

634. அகக்கா ழனவே மரமெனப் படுமே.[4]
Aka-k-kā ḻ-aṉa-v-ē maram-eṉa-p paṭum-ē.

Vegetable kingdom whose inner part is of close grain is called *maram*.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* reads the above *two sūtras* as *one*.

635. தோடே மடலே யோலை யென்றா
ஏடே யிதழே பாளை யென்றா

---

1. கழல் (இளம்.); குழல் (பேரா.).
2. மா (இளம்.); வாள் (பேரா.).
3 & 4. படுமே (இளம்.); மொழிப (பேரா.).

ஈர்க்கே குலையே[5] நேர்ந்தன பிறவும்
புல்லொடு வருமெனச் சொல்லினர் புலவர்.

Tōṭē maṭal ē y-ōlai y-eṉṟā
Ēṭē y-ital̲-ē pāḷai y-eṉṟā
Īrkk-ē kulai-y-ē nērntaṉa piṟa-v-um
Pulloṭu varum-eṉa-t colliṉar pulavar.

Learned men say that the following terms are used to denote the different parts of *pul* genus:—*tōṭù* (sheath), *maṭal* (tagged stem), *ōlai* (leaf), *ēṭù* (strip of leaf), *ital̲* (petal), *pāḷai* (spathe), *īrkkù* (rib of a leaf), *kulai* (bunch), etc.

Note: *Piṟa* denotes, according to *Pērāśiriyam, kurumpai, nuṅkù, nukumpù, pōntai,* etc.

636. இலையே முறியே தளிரே தோடே
சினையே குழையே பூவே யரும்பே
[1]நனையே யுள்ளுறுத் தனையவை யெல்லாம்
மரனொடு வரூஉங் கிளவி யென்ப.

Ilai-y-ē muṟi-y-ē taḷir-ē tōṭ-ē
Ciṉai-y-ē kul̲ai-y-ē pū-v-ē y-arump-ē
Naṉai-y-ē y-uḷḷuṟut t-aṉaiyavai y-ellām
Maraṉoṭu varūuṅ kiḷavi y-eṉpa.

They say that the following terms are used to denote the different parts of *maran* class:—*ilai* (leaf), *muṟi* (tender leaf), *taḷir* (sprout), *tōṭù* (sheath), *ciṉai* (branch), *kul̲ai* (shoot), *pū* (flowers), *arumpù* (bud), *naṉai* (bud), etc.

637. காயே பழமே தோலே செதிளே
வீழோ டென்றாங் கவையு மன்ன.

Kāy-ē pal̲am-ē tōl-ē cetiḷ-ē
Vīl̲ō ṭ-eṉṟāṅ k-avai-y-u m-aṉṉa.

The following belong to both: *kāy* (unripe fruit), *pal̲am* (fruit), *tōl* (inner layer of both), *cetiḷ* (outer layer of both), *vīl̲* (aerial root), etc.

638. நிலந்தீ நீர்வளி விசும்போ டைந்தும்
கலந்த மயக்க முலக மாதலின்
இருதிணை யைம்பா லியனெறி வழாமைத்
திரிவில் சொல்லொடு தழாஅல் வேண்டும்.

---

5. குலையே (இளம்.); குலையென (பேரா.).
1. நனையே (இளம்.); நனை (பேரா.).

Nilan-tī nīr-vaḷi vicumpō ṭ-aintum
Kalanta mayakka m-ulaka m-ātaliṉ
Iru-tiṇai y-ai-m-pā l-iyaṉeṟi vaḻāmai-t
Tirivil collotu taḻāal vēṇṭum.

Since the worldly objects are the result of combination of the five elements earth, fire, water, air and space, they should be expressed correctly without error with reference to the two *tiṇais* and five *pāls*.

639. மரபுநிலை திரிதல் செய்யுட் கில்லை
மரபு வழிப்பட்ட சொல்லி னான.
Marapu-nilai tirital ceyyuṭ k-illai
Marapu vaḻippaṭṭa collī ṉāṉ-a.

One should not go against tradition in writing verse, with reference to words already in use.

640. மரபுநிலை திரியிற் பிறிது பிறிதாகும்.
Marapu-nilai tiriyiṟ piṟitu piṟit-ākum.

If words are used against traditional usage, they will not convey the correct sense.

641. வழக்கெனப் படுவ துயர்ந்தோர் மேற்றே
நிகழ்ச்சி யவர்கட் டாக லான.
Vaḻakk-eṉa-p paṭuva t-uyarntōr mēṟṟē
Nikaḻcci y-avarkaṭ ṭ-āka lāṉ-a.

Vaḻakkū (usage) refers to that of the high class men, since they alone compose poems, etc.

642. மரபுநிலை திரியா மாட்சிய வாகி
உரைபடு நூறா மிருவகை நிலைய
முதலும் வழியுமென நுதலிய நெறியின.
Marapu-nilai tiriyā māṭciya v-āki
Urai-paṭu nūṟā m-iru-vakai nilaiya
Mutal-um vaḻi-y-um-eṉa nutaliya neṟiyiṉa.

The work composed by authors with due attention to traditional usage is of two kinds:—*mutal-nūl* and *vaḻi-nūl.*

643. வினையி னீங்கி விளங்கிய வறிவின்
முனைவன் கண்டது முதனூ லாகும்.
Viṉaiyi ṉīṅki viḷaṅkiya v-aṟiviṉ
Muṉaivaṉ kaṇṭatu mutaṉū l-ākum.

The work composed by a sage of spotless knowledge on account of his bein ree from the effect of *karma* forms the *mutal-nūl.*

644. வழியெனப் படுவ ததன்வழித் தாகும்.
Vaḻi-y-eṉa-p paṭuva t-ataṉ-vaḻit t-ākum.

Voḻi-nūl is that which follows *mutal-nūl.*

645. வழியி னெறியே நால்வகைத் தாகும்.
Vaḻiyi ṉeṟi-y-ē nāl-vakait t-ākum.

Vaḻinūl is of four kinds:

646. தொகுத்தல் விரித்தல் தொகைவிரி மொழிபெயர்த்து
அதர்ப்பட யாத்தலோ டனைமர பினவே.
Tokuttal virittal tokai-viri moḻi-peyarttu
Atar-p-paṭa yāttalō ṭ-aṉai-mara piṉa-v-ē.

They are abridgement, elaboration, abridgement with elaboration and translation.

647. ஒத்த சூத்திர முரைப்பிற் காண்டிகை
மெய்ப்படக் கிளந்த வகைய தாகி
ஈரைங் குற்றமு மின்றி நேரிதின்
முப்பத் திருவகை யுத்தியொடு புணரின்
நூலென மொழிப நுணங்குமொழிப் புலவர்.
Otta cūttira m-uraippiṟ kāṇṭikai
Mey-p-paṭa-k kiḷanta vakaiya t-āki
Īr-ai-ṅ kuṟṟam-u m-iṉṟi nēritiṉ
Muppat t-iru-vakai y-uttiyoṭu puṇariṉ
Nūl-eṉa moḻipa nuṇaṅku-moḻi-p pulavar.

Ripe scholars say that *nūl* is that which is made of *sūtras* which can be commented on properly in commentaries of the *kāṇṭikai,* etc., which are free from the ten defects of composition and where all the thirty-two *uttis* will have room to operate.

648. உரையெடுத் ததன்முன் யாப்பினுஞ் சூத்திரம்
புரைதப வுடன்படக் காண்டிகை புணர்ப்பினும்
[1]விதித்தலும் விலக்கலு [2]மெனவிரு வகையொடு
[3]புணர்ந்தவை நாடிப் புணர்க்கவும் [4]பெறுமே.
Urai-y-eṭut t-ataṉ-muṉ yāppiṉuñ cūttiram
Purai-tapa v-uṭaṉ-paṭa-k kāṇṭikai puṇarppiṉ-um
Vitittal-um vilakkal-u m-eṉa-viru vakaiyoṭu
Puṇarntavai nāṭi-p puṇarkkavum peṟum-ē.

---

1. விதித்தலும் (இளம்.); விடுத்தலும் (பேரா.).
2. எனவிரு (இளம்.); உடையோர் (பேரா.).
3. புணர்ந்தவை (இளம்.); புரைதப (பேரா.).
4. பெறுமே (இளம்.); படுமே (பேரா.).

It is possible to write a commentary independent of *kāṇṭikai* or elucidating the *kāṇṭikai* which establishes the infallible nature of the *sūtras* by telling what the *sūtras* enjoin and what they do not enjoin.

649. மேற்கிளந் தெடுத்த யாப்பினுட் பொருளொடு
சில்வகை யெழுத்தின் செய்யுட் டாகிச்
சொல்லுங் காலை யுரையகத் தடக்கி
நுண்மையொடு புணர்ந்த வொண்மைத் தாகித்
துளக்க லாகாத் துணைமை யெய்தி
அளக்க லாகா வரும்பொருட் டாகிப்
பல்வகை யாலும் பயன்றெறி புடையது
சூத்திரத் தியல்பென யாத்தனர் புலவர்.[1]
Mēṟ-kiḷan t-eṭutta yāppiṉuṭ poruḷoṭu
Cil-vakai y-eḻuttiṉ ceyyuṭ ṭ-āki-c
Colluṅ kālai y-urai-y-akat t-aṭakki
Nuṇmaiyoṭu puṇarnta v-oṇmai-t t-āki-t
Tuḷakka l-ākā-t tuṇaimai y-eyti
Aḷakka l-ākā v-arum-poruṭ ṭ-āki-p
Pal-vakai yāṉ-um payaṉ-ṟeṟi p-uṭaiyatu
Cūttirat t-iyalp-eṉa yāttaṉar pulavar.

Scholars says that it is the nature of *sūtra* to adopt one of the methods, *tokuttal, virittal, tokai-viri,* and *moḻi-peyarttal,* to contain the minimum number of syllables, to be in the form of a verse, to be capable of being commented upon, to be terse and unambiguous, to be tacked on to others that follow, to be rich in meaning and to be of use in many ways.

650. பழிப்பில் சூத்திரம் பட்ட பண்பின்
கரப்பின்றி முடிவது காண்டிகை யாகும்.
Paḻippil cūttiram paṭṭa paṇpiṉ
Karapp-iṉṟi muṭivatu kāṇṭikai y-ākum.

Kāṇṭikai is the commentary which lucidly explains the *sūtra* devoid of spots.

651. விட்டகல் வின்றி விரிவொடு பொருந்திச்
சுட்டிய சூத்திர முடித்தற் பொருட்டா
ஏது நடையினு மெடுத்துக் காட்டினும்
மேவாங் கமைந்த மெய்ந்நெறித் ததுவே.

---

1. अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम् ।
अस्तोभमनवद्यं च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः ॥

Viṭṭakal v-iṉṟi virivoṭu porunti-c
Cuṭṭiya cūttira muṭittaṟ poruṭṭ-ā
Ētu naṭaiyiṉu m-eṭuttuk kāṭṭiṉum
Mēv-āṅ k-amainta mey-n-neṟit tatu-v-ē.

It (*kāṇṭikai*) is of the nature of not going beyond the range of the *sūtra*, of splitting it into words and of explaining its meaning clearly with reasons and illustrations.

652. சூத்திரத் துட்பொரு ளன்றியும் யாப்புற
வின்றி யமையா தியைபவை யெல்லாம்
ஒன்ற வுரைப்ப துரையெனப் படுமே.
Cūttirat tuṭ-poru ḷ-aṉṟi-y-um yāppuṟa
Viṉṟi y-amaiyā t-iyaipavai y-ellām
Oṉṟa v-uraippa t-urai-y-e-ṉa-p paṭum-ē.

It is said to be *urai* which contains not only the literal meaning of the *sūtra*, but also other topics without which the meaning cannot be easily understood.

653. மறுதலைக் கடாஅ மாற்றமு முடைத்தாய்த்
தன்னூ லானும் முடிந்தநூ லானும்
ஐயமு மருட்கையுஞ் செவ்விதி னீக்கித்
தெற்றென வொருபொரு ளொற்றுமை கொளீஇத்
துணிவொடு நிற்ற லென்மனார் புலவர்.
Maṟutalai-k kaṭāa māṟṟam-u m-uṭaittāy-t
Taṉṉū lāṉ-um muṭinta-nū lāṉ-um
Aiyam-u maruṭkai-y-uñ cevviti ṉīkki-t
Teṟṟ-eṉa v-oru-poru ḷ-oṟṟumai koḷīi-t
Tuṇivoṭu niṟṟa l-eṉmaṉār pulavar.

Scholars say that it is the nature of *urai* to raise objections and answer them, to clear doubts and incorrect interpretation on the authority (of the ideas elsewhere) in the book on hand or on that of other works and clearly arrive at the correct meaning.

654. சொல்லப் பட்டன வெல்லா மாண்பும்
மறுதலை யாயின்[1] மற்றது சிதைவே.
Collap paṭṭaṉa v-ellā māṇp-um
Maṟutalai y-āyiṉ maṟṟatu citaiv-ē.

---

1. சூத்திரத்துட்பொருள் (இளம்.); சூத்திரத்துப் பொருள் (பேரா.).

1. ஆயின் (இளம்.); ஆயினும் (பேரா.).

It is considered a flaw, if a work fails to conform to the characteristics mentioned above.

Note 1: The text of *Iḷampūraṇam* here is remarked by the editor to be faulty.

Note 2: *Pērāśiriyar* takes the *anvaya-collappaṭṭaṉa ellām māṇpiṉum, mutaṉulōṭu maṟutalai āyiṉ, atu citaivu,* whose meaning is "even though a work has all the characteristics mentioned above, it is a defect if it differs from the *mutaṉūl.*"

655. சிதைவில வென்ப முதல்வன் கண்ணே.
Citaiv-ila v-eṉpa mutalvaṉ kaṇ-ṇ-ē.

The fault is not observed in *mutaṉūl.*

656. முதல்வழி யாயினும் யாப்பினுட் சிதையும்
வல்லோன் புனையா வாரம் போன்றே.
Mutal-vaḻi y-āyiṉum yāppiṉuṭ citaiyum
Vallōṉ puṉaiyā vāram pōṉṟē.

The *vaḻi-nūl* may go astray in *yāppu, i.e., tokuttal, virittal, tokai-viri* and *moḻi-peyarppu* like the tune repeated by an unskilled man.

Note: *Pērāśiriyar* takes only the first three *yāppu.*

657. சிதைவெனப் படுபவை வசையற நாடின்
கூறியது கூறன் மாறுகொளக் கூறல்
குன்றக் கூறன் மிகைபடக் கூறல்
பொருளில [1]கூறன் மயங்கக் கூறல்
கேட்போர்க் கின்னா யாப்பிற் றாதல்
பழித்த மொழியா [2]னிழுக்கக் கூறல்
தன்னா னொருபொருள் கருதிக் கூறல்
என்ன வகையினு மனங்கோ ளின்மை
அன்ன பிறவு மவற்றுவிரி யாகும்.
Citaiv-eṉa-p paṭupavai vacai-y-aṟa nāṭiṉ
Kūṟiyatu kūṟaṉ māṟukoḷa-k kūṟal
Kuṉṟak kūṟaṉ mikaipaṭa-k kūṟal
Poruḷ-ila kūṟaṉ mayaṅka-k kūṟal
Kēṭpōrk k-iṉṉā yāppiṟ ṟ-ātal
Paḻitta moḻiyā ṉ-iḻukka-k kūṟal
Taṉṉā ṉ-oruporuḷ karuti-k kūṟal
Eṉṉa vakaiyiṉu maṉaṅkō ḷ-iṉmai
Aṉṉa piṟa-v-u m-avaṟṟu-viri y-ākum.

---

1. கூறல் (இளம்.); மொழிதல் (பேரா.).
2. இழுக்க (இளம்.); இழுக்கம் (பேரா.).

If *citavu* is correctly examined, it falls under the following heads:—(1) Repetition of ideas, (2) statement of contradictory ideas (3) omission of ideas, (4) too much elaboration of ideas, (5) statement of meaningless expressions, (6) mixing up of ideas, (7) composing in a *yāppu* which is unpleasant to the hearer, (8) choosing a form of statement which he has already found fault with, (9) interpolation and (10) uncouth expression in diverse ways.

658. எதிர்மறுத் துணரின் திறத்தவு[1] மவையே.

Etir-marut t-uṇariṉ-at tiṟattavu m-avai-y-ē.

It is a defect if the *vaḻi-nūl* has ideas diametrically opposite to those found in *mutaṉūl*.

659. ஒத்த காட்சி யுத்திவகை விரிப்பின்
நுதலிய தறித லதிகார முறையே[2]
[3]தொகுத்துக் கூறல் வகுத்துமெய்ந் நிறுத்தல்[4]
மொழிந்த பொருளோ டொன்ற வைத்தல்
மொழியா ததனை முட்டின்றி முடித்தல்[5]
வாரா ததனான் வந்தது முடித்தல்[6]
வந்தது கொண்டு வாராதது முடித்தல்[7]
முந்து மொழிந்ததன் தலைதடு மாற்றே[8]
[9]ஒப்பக் கூற லொருதலை மொழியே[10]
தன்கோட் கூற லுடம்பொடு புணர்த்தல்.[11]

---

1. அத்திறத்தவும் (இளம்.); திறத்தவும (பேரா.).

2. Cf. Adhikārō nāma triprakārаḥ...Aparō'adhikāraḥ pratiyōgam tasya anirdēśārtha iti yōgē yōgē upatiṣṭhatē (Mahābhāṣya-under *Ṣaṣṭhī sthānēyōgā*) yam artham adhikrtya ucyatē tad adhikaraṇam (Arthaśāstra)

3 Cf. Samāsa-vākyam uddeśaḥ (*ibid*).

4. Cf. Vyāsa-vākyam nirdēśaḥ (*ibid*).

5. Cf. Atiśaya-varṇanā vyākhyānam (*ibid*).

6. Cf. Vaktavyēna sādhanam pradēśaḥ.

7. Cf. Uktēna sādhanam atidēśaḥ (*ibid*) முடித்தல் (இளம்.); உணர்த்தல் (பேரா.).

8. Cf. Pratilōmēna sādhanam viparyayaḥ (Arthaśāstra).

9. Cf. Dṛṣṭēna adṛṣṭasya sādhanam (*ibid*).

10. Cf. Evam vartitavyam ityupadēśaḥ (*ibid*).

11. உடம்பொடு புணர்த்தல் (இளம்.); முறைபிறழாமை (பேரா.).

பிறனுடம் பட்டது தானுடம் படுதல்[1]
இறந்தது காத்த லெதிரது போற்றல்
[2]மொழிவா மென்றற் கூறிற் றென்றல்[3]
[4]தான்குறி யிடுத லொருதலை யன்மை[5]
முடிந்தது காட்ட லாணை கூறல்[6]
பல்பொருட் கேற்பி னல்லது கோடல்
தொகுத்த மொழியான் வகுத்தனர் கோடல்
மறுதலை சிதைத்துத் தன்றுணி புரைத்தல்
[7]பிறன்கோட் கூற லறியா துடம்படல்
பொருளிடை யிடுத லெதிர்பொரு ளுணர்த்தல்
சொல்லி னெச்சஞ் சொல்லியாங் குணர்த்தல்
தந்துபுணர்ந் துரைத்தன் ஞாபகங் கூறல்
[8]உய்த்துக்கொண் டுணர்தலொடு மெய்ப்பட நாடிச்[9]
சொல்லிய வல்ல பிறவவண் வரினும்
சொல்லிய வகையாற் சுருங்க நாடி
மனத்தி னெண்ணி மாசறத் தெரிந்துகொண்டு
இனத்திற் சேர்த்தி யுணர்த்தல் வேண்டும்
நுனித்தகு புலவர் கூறிய நூலே.

Otta kāṭci y-utti-vakai virippiṉ
Nutaliya t-aṟita l-atikāra muṟai-y-ē
Tokuttu-k-kūṟal vakuttu-mey-n niṟuttāl
Moḻinta poruḷō ṭ-oṉṟa vaittal
Moḻiyā tataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal
Vārā tataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal
Vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal
Muntu moḻintataṉ talai-taṭu māṟṟē
Oppa-k kūṟa l-oru-talai moḻi-y-ē
Taṉ-kōṭ kūṟa l-uṭampoṭu puṇarttal
Piṟaṉ-uṭam paṭṭatu tāṉ-uṭam patutal
Iṟantatu kātta l-etiratu pōṟṟal
Moḻivā m-eṉṟaṟ kūṟiṟ ṟ-eṉṟal

1. Cf. Para-vākyam apratiṣiddham anumatam (Artha-sātra)
2. Cf Paśċād ēvam vihitam iti anāgatāvēkṣaṇam (*ibid*).
3. Cf. Purastād ēvam vihitam iti atikrāntāvēkṣaṇam (*ibid*).
4. Cf. Parāir asamitaḥ śabdaḥ svasaṁjñā (*ibid*).
5. Cf. Sarvatra āyattam ēkāntaḥ (*ibid*).
6. Cf. Ēvam nānyathā iti niyōgaḥ (*ibid*)
7. Cf. Ēvam asāu āha ityapadēśaḥ (*ibid*).
8 Cf. Anukta-karaṇam ūhyam (*ibid*).
9. உணர்தலொடு (இளம்.); உணர்த்தலொடு (பேரா.).

Tāṉ-kuṟi y-iṭuta l-oru-talai y-aṉmai
Muṭintatu kāṭṭa l-āṇai kūṟal
Pal-poruṭ kēṟpi ṉallatu kōṭal
Tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal
Maṟutalai citaittu-t taṉṟuṇi p-uraittal
Piṟaṉ-kōṭ kūṟa l-aṟiyā t-uṭampaṭal
Poruḷiṭai y-iṭuta l-etir-poru ḷ-uṇarttal
Colli ṉeccañ colliyāṅ k-uṇarttal
Tantu-puṇarn t-uraittaṉ ñāpakaṅ kūṟal
Uyttukkoṇ ṭ-uṇarṭaloṭu meyppaṭa nāṭi-c
Colliya v-alla piṟa-v-avaṇ variṉum
Colliya vakaiyāṟ curuṇka nāṭi
Maṉatti ṉ-eṇṇi māc-aṟa-t terintu-koṇṭu
Iṉattiṟ cērtti y-uṇarttal vēṇṭum
Nuṉi-t-taku pulavar kūṟiya nūl-ē.

If the classification *utti*[1] is elaborately given to be applied in the works of high class authors, they are (1) understanding the purport of a *sūtra* (2) deciding the extent where one serves as *adhikāra sūtra*[2] or a word or words in a *sūtra* taken along with the *sūtras* that follow (3) brief enumeration of what is to be dilated upon later (4) detailed exposition through classification (5) interpreting a *sūtra* in consonance with what has been mentioned[3] (6) suitably supplementing the content of a *sūtra*[4] (7) interpreting a *sūtra* on the basis of another which is to follow (8) application of analogy (9) adopting an order contrary to that mentioned before (10) statement that one operates similar to another mentioned before (11) deciding one way when there is ambiguity (12) stating one's doctrine not held by predecessors (13) adopting through *jñāpaka* from the use of a word by the author though it is not mentioned in the rules (*Iḷampūraṇam*); not going against the order adopted before (*Pērāśiriyam*) (14) agreeing with the opinion of others (15) restricting the application of a *sūtra*

1. *Utti* is the *tadbhava* of *yukti*, which means here *tantra-yukti*. It means the device employed for the correct understanding of a work.

2. *Adhikāra-sūtra* is one which does not operate by itself but it is taken on to the succeeding *sūtras*. The device is used for the sake of brevity.

3. *Ēkavākyatā* may come under this.

4. 5 and 6 are taken as one by *Pērāśiriyar*.

by one which follows (16) interpretidg a *sūtra* in the light of what will follow (17) referring to what will be stated later on (18) referring to what has been stated before (19) coining technical terms (20) explaining that what is stated with reference to one applies to others also[1] (21) mentioning in strong terms his own view (22) choosing one interpretation among many (23) stating one form to denote many (24) stating one's view after refuting that of others (25) giving out other's opinion (26) agreeing to other views about which he has no definite idea (27) interceding one between *sūtras* though it is not concerned with the main topic (28) stating what is to come (29) interpreting the denotation of the word *etc.* or *rest* from what has been mentioned before (30) taking something found elsewhere and associating it with the topic on hand (31) suggestion and (32) decision through inference. If others also are capable of being taken, they may be carefully scrutinised and added to the list if they deserve it.

Note: Instances to the thirty two *uttis* may elucidate them.

1. From the *sūtra Meyyō ṭiyaiṉu m-uyiriya ṟīriyā* (Tol. E. 10), it is learnt that consonant has no *mātrā* if it is immediately followed by a vowel.
2. Deciding that *avaṟṟuḷ* in (Tol. E. 3) is taken in the *sūtras* 4, 8, 9 and *avaṟṟuḷ* in (Tol. Col. 121) is taken in many of the *sūtras* that follow.
3. Mūṉṟu in (Tol. E. 1) refers to the three specifically mentioned in the succeeding *sūtra.*
4. The second *sūtra* in *Eḻuttatikāram* specifies the three.
5. Interpreting Tol. Col. 83 as *Śivañanamuṉivar* in the light of the preceding *sūtras.*
6. Taking that *au* may also be used as *av* in consonance with *au* as *a u.*
7. Interpretation of *Āṟaṉ urupiṉ* (Tol. E. 116) in the light of *Āṟaṉ urupiṉ* (Tol. E. 162).
8. The *sandhi* between the words denoting one to nine and the word *āyiram* is not mentioned in the *Kuṟṟiyal-ukara-p-puṇariyal*. It should be under-

---

1. Oru-talai-y-anmai muṭintatu kāṭṭal is taken to be *one* by *Iḷampūraṇar* and *two* by *Pērāśiriyar*.

stood on the analogy of (Tol. E. 439 to Tol. E. 444).

9. Mention of the place of articulation of ṟ, ṉ r, l, ḻ and ḷ before that of *p* and *m* in the *Piṟappiyal* of *Eḻuttatikāram*.

10. *A-v-v-iyal nilaiyum* in Tol. E. 12.

11. Deciding that Tol. Col. 64 deals with the names of cases and not case—suffixes in the light of Tol. Col. 62 and Tol. E. 114.

12. Stating that the number of cases is *eight* in Tol. Col. 63, though the predecessors have taken it to be *seven*.

13. *Ā-y-irutiṇaiyiṉ* (Tol. Col. 1) is a *jñāpaka* to the use of *y* as *uṭampaṭumey* after the lengthened demonstrative root *a*.

14. *Eṉmaṉār* in (Tol. Col. 1) tells us that *Tolkāppiyaṉār* agrees with his predecessors in the designation *uyar-tiṇai* and *a.˙.ṟiṇai*.

15. The application of *ataṉōṭiyaintaoruviṉai-k-kiḷavi* in Tol. Col. 74 is restricted in its application by the *sūtra Oru-viṉai-y-oṭu-c-col* (Tol. Col. 91).

16. Interpreting the *sūtra Taṉmai-c-collē* (Tol. Col. 43) to deal with the subject of the sentence in the light of the *sūtra* '*Avaṟṟuḷ-paṉmai-y-uraikkum* (Tol. Col. 209) which deals with the predicate.

17. *Uṇara-k-kūṟiṉ muṉṉar-t tōṉṟum* (Tol. E. 35) refers to what will be said in *Kuṟṟiyal-ukara-p-puṇariyal*.

18. *Māttirai vakaiyu m-eḻuttiyal vakaiyum mēṟ kiḷan taṉavē* (Tol. Poruḷ 311).

Refers to what was said in the early chapters of *Eḻuttatikāram*.

19. Naming the cases *ai-vēṟṟumai*, *oṭu-vēṟṟumai*, etc., as *iraṇṭām-vēṟṟumai*, *mūṉṟām vēṟṟumai*, etc.

20. *Aṭaiyoṭu tōṉṟiṉu m-ataṉ-ō r-aṟṟē* (Tol. E. 319).

21. *Viḷi-koḷ vataṉkaṇ viḷiyō ṭ-eṭṭ-ē* (Tol. Col. 63).

22. Interpretation of *Teyvaccilaiyār* of the expression *Iru-peyar pal-peyar* in Tol. Col. 417 is better than that of other commentators.

23. Mention of *Ceyyum* in Tol. Col. 222 to denote both the infinite verb and the relative participle.

24. *Mū-v-aḷa p-icaitta l-ōr-eḻut t-iṉṟ-ē* (Tol. E. 5) and *Nīṭṭam vēṇṭi ṉ-a-v-v-aḷa p-uṭaiyakūtti y-eḷūta l-eṉmaṉār pulavar* (ibid. 6).

25. *Valleḻut t-eṉpa kacaṭa tapaṟa* (Tol. E. 19).

26. *Kūṟiya kiḷavi-p poruṇilai y-alla Vēṟu-piṟa tōṉṟiṉu m-avaṟṟoṭum koḷal-ē* (Tol. Col. 390).

27. The *sūtra Mutal-uñ ciṉai-y-um porul-vēṟu paṭāa Nuvaluṅ kālai-c coṟ-kuṟip pīṉ-a-vē* (Tol. Col. 89- intercedes the *sūtras* dealing with the use of case-suffixes.

28. *Kaṭi-col l-illai kālattu-p paṭiṉ-ē* (Tol. Col. 452).

29. In *Kaṇṇum tōḷ-u mulai-y-um piṟa-v-um piṟa* is taken to refer to other limbs occurring in pairs like *kātu, kai* etc.

30. Taking the *sūtra Kuṉṟicai moḻivayiṉ ṉiṉṟicai niṟaikku Neṭṭeḻut t-impa r-otta-kuṟ r-eḻutt-ē.* (Tol. E. 41) with: *Nīṭṭam vēṇṭi ṉ-a-v-v-aḷa p-uṭaiya Kūṭṭi y-eḻūata l-eṉmaṉārpulavar.* (Tol. E. 6).

31. The statement *Iṟṟunin ṟ-icaikkum patiṉō r-eḻuttum* (Tol. Col. 10) is a *jñāpaka* that *ṉ* and *ḷ* in *Ṉa.˙.kā ṉoṟṟē y.āṭūu v-aṟi-col* (ibid. 5) and *Ḷa.˙.kā ṉ-oṟṟē makaṭūu v-aṟi-col* (ibid. 6) come at the end nouns and verbs.

In the *sūtra Um-m-un ṭ-āku m-iṭanum-ā r-uṇṭē* (Tol. Col. 292) *Um* has to be taken to be the termition of both the finite verb *ceyyvm* and the relative participle ceyyum in the light of the *sūtras* Cols. 222, 227. 238 etc.

—:o:—

Marapiyal ends.

Poruḷ-atikāram ends.

AVANTISUNDARĪ KATHĀSĀRA

अवन्तिसुन्दरीकथासारः

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION

BY

G. HARIHARA SASTRI

KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE
MYLAPORE, MADRAS
1957